

City of Santa Paula

Planning Commission Agenda

CHAIRMAN GAIL "IKE" IKERD
VICE CHAIRMAN FRED ROBINSON
COMMISSIONER MICHAEL SOMMER



Regular Meeting of the
SANTA PAULA PLANNING COMMISSION

January 24, 2017

6:30 PM – Regular Meeting

SANTA PAULA CITY HALL
970 VENTURA STREET
SANTA PAULA, CA 93060

Copies of staff reports or other written documentation relating to each item of business referred to on this agenda are on file in the Planning Department office and are available for public inspection. If you have any questions regarding any agenda item, contact the Planning Department at (805) 933-4214.

WELCOME TO THE CITY OF SANTA PAULA PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

You are invited to attend all Planning Commission meetings. Agendas are posted in the front of City Hall in advance of the scheduled meetings. Information for meetings may be obtained by contacting the Planning Department Office. The Santa Paula Planning Commission's regular meetings start at 6:30 p.m. the fourth Tuesday of each month in the City Hall Council Chambers located at 970 Ventura Street in Santa Paula.

BRINGING ITEMS BEFORE THE PLANNING COMMISSION

If you wish to speak at a Planning Commission meeting, please fill out a yellow Public Comment Form noting your name and address and submit the form to the City Clerk. Include the Agenda Item number, when appropriate.

1. Items Not on the Agenda: If you wish to discuss an item which is not scheduled on the Agenda, you may address the Planning Commission during *Public Comment*. Please realize that due to the limitations placed on the Planning Commission by provisions of the *California Government Code*, the Planning Commission ordinarily cannot take action on any item that is not on the agenda. Because of these restrictions, expect that matters that you identify during public comment will be referred to staff or considered on a future agenda.

2. Agenda Items: Items being considered by the Planning Commission may appear on the Consent Calendar, as an Order of Business, or as a Public Hearing. Public comments on each type of item are handled differently, as explained below:

- a. For items appearing on the Consent Calendar, please submit a Public Comment Form before the Commission takes action on the Consent Calendar. Items that receive a Public Comment Form may be pulled from the Consent Calendar by the Chairperson and discussed separately by the Planning Commission.
- b. For items appearing as an Order of Business, the Chairperson will announce the Agenda Item and request the staff report; the staff member responsible will give a brief summary of the report; the Planning Commission will have an opportunity to ask questions of staff; members of the public will be given an opportunity to comment on the item and ask additional questions (all members of the public should speak directly into the microphone at the speaker's platform); and the Planning Commission will discuss the item and then take appropriate action.
- c. For items on which a Public Hearing is scheduled, the Chairperson will open the public hearing and receive the staff report; members of the public will be given an opportunity to comment on the item and ask additional questions (all members of the public should speak directly into the microphone at the speaker's platform); the Planning Commission will discuss the item; and the Chairperson will close the public hearing after Planning Commission action.

PLEASE NOTE: *Be advised that if you bring a legal challenge to an action, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the meeting described in this Agenda, or in written correspondence delivered to the Planning Commission at or before the meeting. Any action is subject to the ninety-day time period set forth in Code of Civil Procedure § 1094.6.*

In compliance with the **Americans with Disabilities Act**, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the Planning Department at (805) 933-4214. Notification 48 hours before the meeting will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting. (28 CFR 35, 102-35.104 ADA Title II.) Written materials distributed to the Planning Commission within 72 hours of the Planning Commission meeting are available for public inspection immediately upon distribution in the Planning Department's office.



CITY OF SANTA PAULA
PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES • JANUARY 24, 2017

Regular Meeting

Council Chambers

6:30 PM

All exhibits, petitions, photos, and other materials submitted to the Commission in conjunction with any item on this Agenda become a part of the City of Santa Paula's records and are not returnable.

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Ikerd called the meeting to order at 6:31 PM.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chairman Ikerd led the Pledge of Allegiance.

3. ROLL CALL

Attendee Name	Title	Status	Arrived
Fred W. Robinson	Vice Chairman	Present	6:30 PM
Michael Sommer	Commissioner	Present	6:30 PM
Gail Ikerd	Chairman	Present	6:30 PM
Janna Minsk	Planning Director	Present	6:30 PM
James Mason	Deputy Planning Director	Present	6:30 PM
Tom Tarantino	Planning Technician	Present	6:30 PM
Gregg Kettles	Assistant City Attorney	Present	6:30 PM
Joyce Parker-Bozylinski	Contract Planner	Present	6:30 PM

4. FINAL AGENDA

Agenda final as submitted. Adherence to Brown Act requirements for applicable Public Hearing items confirmed by Planning Technician.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

REMINDER: in order to minimize distractions during public meetings, all personal communication devices should be turned off or put in a non-audible mode.

At this time, members of the public may comment on any item not appearing on the agenda that is within the subject-matter jurisdiction of the Planning Commission. A Public Comment Form must be submitted to the Secretary before the beginning of the Public Comment period in order to be recognized to speak. Individuals submitting Public Comment Forms after the beginning of the Public Comment period will not be allowed to speak at this time, but may be recognized to speak by the Chair at the conclusion of the meeting. Individual Commissioners may briefly respond to Public Comments or ask questions for clarification. The Planning Commission may direct staff to report to the

Planning Commission on the item at a later meeting. For items appearing on the Agenda, the public will be invited to make comments at the time the item comes up for Planning Commission consideration. If a member of the public wishes to address a Consent Calendar item, please submit a Public Comment Form for that item. It may then be discussed separately by the Commission, and the public will be invited to make comments at that time. At all times, please use the microphone and write your name and address on the Public Comment Form provided.

No public comment.

6. CONSENT CALENDAR

Information has been provided to the Planning Commission on all matters listed under the Consent Calendar. These items are considered to be routine, and are normally approved by one motion. If discussion is requested by a Commissioner on any item, or a member of the public wishes to comment on an item, that item may be removed from the Consent Calendar for separate action.

A. Approval of Minutes for the December 13, 2016 Planning Commission Meeting

- **Staff Presentation:** Tom Tarantino, Planning Technician

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Staff recommends a motion for approval of the Minutes of the December 13, 2016 Planning Commission Meeting.

Vice Chairman Robinson moved to approve the minutes of the December 13, 2016 Planning Commission Meeting as submitted. Commissioner Sommer seconded the motion. All were in favor and the motion carried.

7. ORDER OF BUSINESS

A. Request to Change Planning Commission Meeting Start Time

- **Staff Presentation:** Janna Minsk, Planning Director

Pursuant to a request for a future agenda item made by Commissioner Sommer at the December 13, 2016 Planning Commission meeting, staff and Commissioners shall explore the option of shifting to an earlier starting time for all future regularly-scheduled Planning Commission meetings.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Per the City Attorney, any change in meeting start time must be via revision to the Planning Commission rules, enacted by formal resolution. As such, staff recommends tabling discussion of an earlier start time by the three current Planning Commissioners, and revisiting the matter when the two vacant Planning Commission seats are filled.

Director Minsk presented the item, and explained the requirement contained in the Planning Commission bylaws that any change to the meeting start time be adopted via formal resolution. Director Minsk also noted that there are currently only three sworn Commissioners, and therefore may be prudent to table the item until there is a full complement of five Commissioners, which may be several months.

Commissioner Sommer recognized Director Minsk's concern regarding changing the time with only three active Commissioners. Commissioner Sommer stated, however, that the matter has already been discussed several times, and moved to direct staff to draft a formal resolution changing Planning Commission Rule 2.3, moving the meeting start time to 6:00pm on the 4th Tuesday of every month. Vice Chairman Robinson seconded the motion. All were in favor under roll call vote, and the motion carried.

RESULT:	ADOPTED AS AMENDED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Michael Sommer, Commissioner
SECONDER:	Fred W. Robinson, Vice Chairman
AYES:	Robinson, Sommer, Ikerd

8. PUBLIC HEARING

- Verification of Legal Notice Requirements for Public Hearing
- Declaration of Conflicts
- Declaration of Ex Parte Contacts
- Open Public Hearing

Chairman Ikerd opened the Public Hearing at 6:35pm.

Conflicts of Interest: None.

Ex Parte Contacts: Vice Chairman Robinson stated he met with the applicant (no reference made to which applicant) prior to this hearing, during which time the applicant shared his vision of the project. Vice Chairman Robinson also stated he attended the Downtown Merchants/Chamber of Commerce meeting on 11/16/2016, at which this project (again, no reference to which project) was extensively discussed. No other Ex Parte contacts declared.

A. 16-CUP-05 Palazzio Event Center

- **Location:** 814 East Main St. (APN: 103-0-103-055)
- **Applicant:** Jose Melgar
- **Representative:** Marilyn Appleby (Anderson Kulwiec Appleby Architects)

- **Zoning:** CBD (Central Business District)
- **General Plan Designation:** Commercial Office
- **Environmental:** Staff has determined the project to be Categorically Exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines per §15301 (Class 1, Existing Facilities)
- **Staff Presentation:** Joyce Parker-Bozylinski, Contract Planner

A request for approval of a (1) Conditional Use Permit for an event center with live entertainment and dancing allowed; 2) Conditional Use Permit to allow a Type 41 (on-site beer and wine) and Type 47 (on-site beer, wine & distilled spirits) alcohol license in conjunction with the new event hall; and 3) Design Review Permit for facade improvements.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission select Alternative No. 1 and approve Conditional Use Permit No. 2016-CUP-05 subject to the conditions of approval listed in the resolution.

Contract Planner Parker-Bozylinski presented the item to the Commissioners.

Commissioner Sommer asked if the maximum occupancy of 569 included staff for events.

Contract Planner Parker-Bozylinski responded yes, the 569 figure is a total occupancy load.

Commissioner Sommer asked how the calculations for the necessary bathrooms was done, as the number seems insufficient.

Contract Planner Parker-Bozylinski responded that the Planning Dept. Also questioned the sufficiency of the proposed bathrooms. She continued that the bathroom calculations were done by the project architect, and used the formula approved in the California Building Code. Contract Planner Parker-Bozylinski stated the architect could explain the calculations later in the meeting.

Vice Chairman Robinson expressed concern that trash is an ongoing problem in the area, and asked if trash bins are included in the project.

Contract Planner Parker-Bozylinski stated there is an existing trash enclosure in the rear of the building, but an additional enclosure may be added in the future, should Public Works require it.

Chairman Ikerd asked the applicant, Jose Luis Melgar, to speak.

Mr. Melgar stated he has been a resident of Santa Paula for 27 years, and this event center project has been a dream of his for two decades. He is a professional photographer, and over the years has seen many Santa Paulans hold their events in neighboring cities. He feels this center will be a beautiful addition to the city that addresses a definite need, and will hopefully bring more people and jobs into the downtown. Mr. Melgar also stated he has the full support of the Lee Cole, CEO of Calavo, to hold corporate events at his location in the future.

Connie Tushla, resident at 615 Teague Dr., spoke in support of Mr. Melgar and the project, and feels it will be great for the downtown and possible tax revenue.

Steven Meisel, resident at 808 E. Main St. #B, stated he lives with his wife and infant right next to the project location, and has serious concerns about the possible noise and additional parking problems the project may bring. Mr. Meisel stated these problems, plus the sale of alcohol, creates safety concerns that may ultimately force him to move his family elsewhere.

Sharon Robinson, resident at 380 E. View Dr., spoke in support of Mr. Melgar and the project, and thinks it may be a perfect location for her dance club meetings.

Seana-Marie Sesma, resident at 7676 Pine Grove Rd., spoke in support of Mr. Melgar and the project, stating that as an event producer, she regularly has to take large events out of the city. She thinks being able to keep the events in town will be great for tax revenues, local restaurants, and hotels.

Lorenzo Moraza, resident at 675 Southwick St. And President of the Latino Town Hall, spoke in support of Mr. Melgar and the project.

Elvia Hernandez, resident at 427 N. Oak St., spoke in support of Mr. Melgar and the project.

Antonio Rodriguez, resident at 808 E. Main St. #A and neighbor to Mr. Meisel, spoke in support of Mr. Melgar and the project.

Robert Garcia Jr., resident at 830 E. Santa Paula St. And owner of Garcia Funeral Home, spoke in support of Mr. Melgar and the project.

Hannah Duncan, resident of Ventura and local event planner, spoke in support of Mr. Melgar and the project.

Jeff Becker, resident of Ventura and property owner of the project site, spoke in support of the project.

Ray Frutos, resident at 710 E. Santa Paula St., spoke in support of Mr. Melgar and the project and does not see parking as an issue.

Tina Urias, resident at 919 La Vuelta Pl., spoke in support of Mr. Melgar and the project and hopes local schools can hold their proms there in the future, and feels Mr. Melgar can work out any problems with neighbors.

Fr. Charles Lueras, pastor of Guadalupe Church at 427 Oak St., spoke in support of Mr. Melgar and the project.

Kathyleen Rodriguez, resident of 132 Eliot St. And niece of the applicant, spoke in support of Mr. Melgar and the project.

Mark Dominguez, native of Santa Paula and resident of Oxnard, spoke in support of Mr. Melgar and the project.

Jennifer Heighton, resident at 1273 Boosey Rd. And Director of the Santa Paula Art Museum, spoke in support of Mr. Melgar and the project.

John Chaney, resident at 71 Hallock Dr., spoke in support of Mr. Melgar and the project.

Zahid Shah, resident at 145 S. 10th St., spoke in support of Mr. Melgar and the project.

Sheryl Hamlin, resident at 830 Teague Dr., spoke in support of Mr. Melgar and the project.

Aman Gupta, owner of Liberty Tax at 922 E. Main St., spoke in support of Mr. Melgar and the project.

Dave Anderson, resident of Santa Paula and partner at AKA Architects representing the project, stated he was available for questions.

Commissioner Sommer asked for further clarification of the bathroom count and reiterated he feels it is insufficient.

Marilyn Appleby, architect from AKA Architects, explained the bathroom count for the project, stating the number of bathrooms is compliant with the California Plumbing Code's A2 (Banquet Hall) occupancy load and ADA requirements, and is based on the number of fixtures. Ms. Appleby stated that city inspectors would also use this Code in their calculations, and clarified that California Building Code and California Plumbing Code requirements for bathrooms occasionally differ, as in this case. (Note: a portion of Ms. Appleby's statements are inaudible, as she chose to speak at the overhead display, away from the podium/microphone.)

Contract Planner Parker-Bozylinski stated the restroom numbers were discussed at the project review meeting and will be revisited during Plan Check, though to her

best recollection, the Chief Building Inspector had signed off on the current bathroom plans.

Contract Planner Parker-Bozylinski and Ms. Appleby continued that the Building & Safety Dept. Would not issue building permits unless they are satisfied with the number of bathroom facilities, regardless of the minimum code requirement.

Vice Chairman Robinson asked if the upstairs bathrooms would be available during events.

Ms. Appleby responded yes, the upstairs bathrooms would be available. (Note: a portion of Ms. Appleby's statements are again inaudible, as she chose to speak at the overhead display, away from the podium/microphone.)

Vice Chairman Robinson asked if the number and location of bathroom facilities comply with Americans With Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements.

Contract Planner Parker-Bozylinski responded that the applicants "provided the page out of the Building Code" to Building & Safety, though she could not recall with 100% certainty if Building and Safety had signed off.

Vice Chairman Robinson asked if the remodel will do anything with the stairwells.

Ms. Appleby responded that the current railings are too large for ADA compliance and will be reduced. An additional back exit with stairs will be added to comply with current exiting code.

Vice Chairman Robinson asked how wide is the current upward stairway.

Ms. Appleby responded approximately five feet wide. (Note: a portion of Ms. Appleby's statements are again inaudible, as she chose to speak at the overhead display, away from the podium/microphone.)

Vice Chairman Robinson stated the downstairs restrooms surely should not open directly into the banquet area, as it would be unsightly, though he stated he is sure Mr. Melgar will address the issue, based on the high quality of his other work. Regarding the bathrooms, he continued, as long as they are compliant with current code, he does not have an issue.

Vice Chairman Robinson asked if the green tiles in the building would be retained.

Ms. Appleby responded yes, the tiles would be retained.

Vice Chairman Robinson stated he has fond childhood memories of the building as a vibrant J.C. Penney department store, and is glad the historical character of the building will be retained. He feels the parking issue can be addressed, as the area

was able to accommodate the closing of the Ojai Valley Music Festival last year, along with the crowds at the regular Cruise Nights. He is concerned about the impact on the neighbors and encouraged Mr. Melgar to work with them going forward.

Mr. Melgar stated it is definitely his intention to work with the neighbors to address their concerns.

Chairman Ikerd stated he knows Mr. Melgar will work with the neighbors about noise. He stated he has doubts about the enforceability of diagonal parking regulations in the project, but knows that people will "figure it out." Overall, Chairman Ikerd stated he likes the project and looks forward to the benefits it will bring the downtown.

Commissioner Sommer echoed Chairman Ikerd's statements, especially regarding parking.

Mr. Melgar stated he will "put the fear of God" in those attending events at his center, that the SPPD will be patrolling the diagonal parking spaces and will be ticketing.

Vice Chairman Robinson moved to adopt Resolution No. 3759, a request for approval of a (1) Conditional Use Permit for an event center with live entertainment and dancing allowed; (2) Conditional Use Permit to allow a Type 41 (16-CUP-07/on-site beer and wine) and Type 47 (16-CUP-08/on-site beer, wine, and distilled spirits) alcohol license in conjunction with the new event hall; and (3) Design Review Permit for facade improvements, including Items 16, 17 and 18 as amended in the Conditions of Approval. Commissioner Sommer seconded the motion. All were in favor under roll call vote, and the motion carried.

Chairman Ikerd temporarily suspended the Public Hearing for a short recess at 8:04pm.

RESULT:	ADOPTED AS AMENDED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Fred W. Robinson, Vice Chairman
SECONDER:	Michael Sommer, Commissioner
AYES:	Robinson, Sommer, Ikerd

B. 16-CDP-07 La Terraza Event Center

- **Location:** 1000 & 1008 East Main St. (APN: 101-0-214-155, -165)
- **Applicant:** Adan Sandoval
- **Representative:** Pedro Garcia

- **Zoning:** CBD (Central Business District)
- **General Plan Designation:** Commercial Office
- **Environmental:** Staff has determined the project to be Categorical Exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines per §15301 (Class 1, Existing Facilities)
- **Staff Presentation:** Joyce Parker-Bozylinski, Contract Planner

A request for approval of a Conditional Use Permit to allow 1) the expansion of an existing restaurant use into an adjacent commercial building to establish a banquet facility with live entertainment and dancing allowed, and 2) to allow the expansion of an existing Type 41 (on-site beer and wine) alcohol license in conjunction with the expanded restaurant and new banquet facility; as well as a Design Review Permit for façade improvements.

RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission select Alternative No. 1 and approve Conditional Use Permit and Design Review Permit No. 2016-CDP-07 subject to the conditions of approval listed in the resolution.

Chairman Ikerd reinstated the Public Hearing at 8:09pm.

Contract Planner Parker-Bozylinski presented the item to the Commissioners.

Commissioner Sommer asked if the applicant would be enlarging the current restaurant.

Contract Planner Parker-Bozylinski responded the applicant has always indicated in their application materials that there are two components to their project - moving and expanding the restaurant and adding a banquet hall. To date, however, the Planning Dept. Has not seen plans for how the applicant will make that all work.

Commissioner Sommer questioned whether not knowing how the applicant will divide the space changes the parking dynamics.

Contract Planner Parker-Bozylinski responded an enlargement of the restaurant into the neighboring space would not require additional parking, however, adding banquet space would trigger additional parking requirements.

Commissioner Sommer asked if expanding the restaurant would require a CUP.

Contract Planner Parker-Bozylinski and Director Minsk responded that the applicant would have to present plans to staff and obtain the proper health department approvals, but would not require an additional CUP for a restaurant expansion.

Vice Chairman Robinson asked if the applicant was seeking a Type 47 (distilled spirits) ABC permit, or if they would only serve beer and wine under and expansion of their existing Type 41 ABC permit.

Contract Planner Parker-Bozylinski responded that the ABC department had initially approved a Type 41 expansion for the applicant in 2014, but the applicant would now have to apply to reactivate the approval.

Vice Chairman Robinson asked for a better understanding of where the current and proposed additional doors would be located, and if the facade improvements proposed in 2014 would change.

Contract Planner Parker-Bozylinski responded the applicant is proposing addition of another front door (totaling two), one new entrance/exit to the rear parking lot, one new doorway to the existing restaurant (as there are no kitchen facilities proposed in for the event center outside of the existing restaurant) and one new doorway to the existing patio. There will be no change to the 2014 facade improvement plans.

Vice Chairman Robinson stated he is comfortable with the proposed additional bathroom facilities and ADA compliance, and still likes the proposal, as he did back in 2014. He does not see the two proposed event centers as competing, since this project seems to be more of a restaurant expansion and occasional banquet facility than Mr. Melgar's.

Daniel Lona, Santa Paula native and lender/broker for the project, made a brief verbal presentation on late-arriving changes to the project, and stated the proposed 1:30am closing time originated with the state ABC code. Mr. Lona feels Santa Paula is likely the only city in the county that asks for a 12:30am closing time. Mr. Lona also stated he and the applicant researched the required shuttle that was part of the 2014 approval, but found the \$86,000 cost to be prohibitive, unless the city wants to split the cost. Valets, he stated, should be sufficient. Lastly, regarding the proposed cover charge, Mr. Lona stated the applicant does not intend to open a nightclub, but instead hopes to recover costs of possible mariachis, entertainment, etc.

Adan Sandoval, project applicant, stated he hopes to possibly combine dinner and music, and thus seeks the cover charge. He does not, he stated, wish to expand his restaurant into the entire building, just a small part of it, with occasional banquets or buffets, perhaps on Sunday mornings. This project would not, in any case, be a bar, though he does intend to enter the ABC raffle for a Type 47 hard liquor license.

Vice Chairman Robinson asked if this new addition of a Type 47 ABC license changes the current project application.

Contract Planner Parker-Bozylinski and Director Minsk responded that Mr. Sandoval would have to apply for an amended CUP if he chose to pursue a Type 47 license, and that it was not included in this evening's proposal.

Laura Espinosa, resident at 233 Corte Linda and former City Councilmember, stated she fully supports Mr. Sandoval and the project as presented, and encouraged the Commissioners to consider each project on its own merits. Ms. Espinosa also stated she thinks the shuttle requirement is excessive.

Commissioner Sommer asked where the shuttle fits into this project, as it was his understanding that the parking would be valet.

Contract Planner Parker-Bozylinski responded that the shuttle was required by the City Council as part of their enforcement agreement in 2014. The shuttle is required as a Condition of the current project on weekdays only.

Chairman Ikerd stated he likes the project, but not the shuttle requirement, which he feels should be stricken.

Contract Planner Parker-Bozylinski responded the Commissioners could pick a larger trigger number for the shuttle requirement, or be willing to use existing parking.

Vice Chairman Robinson stated he also feels the shuttle is a non-starter. He asked if city staff could monitor the parking situation for the first year to assess the situation.

Director Minsk stated the shuttle Condition could be removed, if the applicant is willing to monitor the situation and report back within the first year on any parking problems, especially since the applicant already requested waiver of the \$2,500 deposit for city staff time in monitoring.

Contract Planner Parker-Bozylinski asked the Commissioners to identify a tipping point that valet service would be needed.

Director Minsk suggested modifying Condition 10 to require all events on Friday-Saturday-Sunday to have valet service, and striking Condition 11 requiring shuttle service.

Contract Planner Parker-Bozylinski added that Condition 9 be modified to have the start time changed to 7:00am to accommodate breakfast functions.

Commissioner Sommer moved to adopt Resolution No. 3960, approving Conditional Use Permit and Design Review Permit No. 2016-CDP-07, subject to the items in listed in red on the amended draft (Nos. 9, 15, 20, 21, 22) and the rewording of

parking-related items 10 and 11, as stated. Vice Chairman Robinson seconded the motion. All were in favor under roll call vote, and the motion carried.

Chairman Ikerd closed the Public Hearing at 8:58pm.

RESULT:	ADOPTED AS AMENDED [UNANIMOUS]
MOVER:	Michael Sommer, Commissioner
SECONDER:	Fred W. Robinson, Vice Chairman
AYES:	Robinson, Sommer, Ikerd

- Close Public Hearing

9. NEW BUSINESS

Director Minsk stated that due to Commissioner Demers' departure, a new appointee from the Planning Commission is needed as soon as possible for the Design Assistance Committee. She reminded the Commissioners that the DAC meets in the Community Development Building on an as-needed basis, generally on a weekday afternoon and not more than every two weeks. The DAC reviews projects, or aspects of projects (signage, etc.) for conformance with City regulations and aesthetics, and provides feedback and guidance to project applicants prior to appearing before the Planning Commission. Appointment to the DAC as a Commissioner lasts until that Commissioner's term expires.

Chairman Ikerd volunteered to serve as the Design Assistance Committee representative from the Planning Commission, until a replacement can be found.

10. CITY COMMUNICATIONS

A. Planning Department

Director Minsk stated the ongoing food trucks issue would be addressed by the City Council at their February 6, 2017 meeting, with an overview of the city's peddler-vendor ordinance.

Director Minsk stated the General Plan update is proceeding, with several upcoming events and activities.

Director Minsk stated there were numerous speakers at a recent City Council meeting regarding the Sparkuhl Ranch project, which was approved years ago and has received several tentative map extensions to which they are entitled by law. Director Minsk clarified that various design aspects of the project will still be required to come before Planning Commission and/or City Council as the project proceeds.

Commissioner Sommer inquired about the status of the Hardison House project lawsuit. Assistant City Attorney Kettles stated that, as the project has been

approved, it is allowed to proceed unless an injunction is issued by the court. To date, no such action has been taken.

B. Planning Commission

Director Minsk stated that Commissioner Demers accepted a position as Executive Officer at the Merchant Marine Academy in Kings Point, New York, and has resigned from the Planning Commission. On behalf of the City of Santa Paula, she thanked him for his service to the community as a Planning Commissioner and wished him well in his new endeavors.

Director Minsk also stated that, as the late Commissioner Wacker's seat remains unfilled, there are now two vacancies on the Planning Commission. The City Clerk is working to repost these vacancies and arrange interviews, as addressing said vacancies is now an agenda item for the February 6, 2017 City Council meeting.

Chairman Ikerd inquired as to whether a high school student could sit in as a Commissioner as a learning experience, since there seems to be "no light at the end of the tunnel" on filling the current vacancies.

Director Minsk replied that staff will take the high school student idea under consideration.

Director Minsk continued that a new Planning Commission Chair and Vice Chair would normally be appointed at the January meeting, however, selection has been postponed until a full cohort of five Commissioners is available. The current Chair and Vice Chair agreed to continue in their respective positions until that time.

11. REQUEST FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

Any Planning Commissioner may make a motion only to place an item on a future Agenda. Members may discuss whether or not the item should be placed on the agenda and the description of the item. The motion is non-debatable. Placement of an item on a future Agenda requires a majority vote. The Planning Director has discretion as to when the item will be placed on the Agenda, unless otherwise directed by the Planning Commission.

None.

12. ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Ikerd adjourned the meeting at 9:11 PM.

NOTICE: Actions by the Planning Commission on the above items cannot be appealed to the City Council after 4:30 p.m. on **February 3, 2017**. Be advised that if you bring a legal challenge to a Planning Commission decision, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the meeting or in written correspondence delivered to the Planning Commission at or before the meeting.