

# City of Santa Paula

## *Planning Commission Agenda*

CHAIRMAN GAIL "IKE" IKERD  
VICE CHAIRMAN FRED ROBINSON  
COMMISSIONER MARGAUX BANGS  
COMMISSIONER W. EARL MCPHAIL  
COMMISSIONER MICHAEL SOMMER



Regular Meeting of the  
SANTA PAULA PLANNING COMMISSION

May 23, 2017

6:00 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 6:00 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 • MAY 23, 2017

Regular Meeting

Council Chambers

6:00 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 6:00pm and welcomed the two new Planning Commissioners.

### 2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Commissioner Sommer led the Pledge of Allegiance.

### 3. ROLL CALL

Attendee Name	Title	Status	Arrived
Fred W. Robinson	Vice Chairman	Present	6:00 PM
Michael Sommer	Commissioner	Present	6:00 PM
Gail Ikerd	Chairman	Present	6:00 PM
Margaux Bangs	Commissioner	Present	6:00 PM
W. Earl McPhail	Commissioner	Present	6:00 PM
James Mason	Deputy Planning Director	Present	6:00 PM
Tom Tarantino	Planning Technician	Present	6:00 PM
Gregg Kettles	Assistant City Attorney	Present	6:00 PM
Janna Minsk	Planning Director	Excused	

Planning Director Minsk was ill and excused from this meeting. Deputy Director Mason assumed her duties for the evening.

### 4. FINAL AGENDA

Agenda final as submitted. Adherence to applicable portions of the Ralph M. Brown Act confirmed by the 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 April 25, 2017 Planning Commission Meeting

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

#### RECOMMENDED ACTION:

**Staff recommends a motion for approval of the Minutes of the April 25, 2017 Planning Commission Meeting.**

Vice Chairman Robinson moved to approve the Minutes of the April 25, 2017 Planning Commission Meeting as submitted. Commissioner Sommer seconded the motion. Commissioners Bang and McPhail abstained from voting, as they were not yet sworn in as Commissioners for the April 25th meeting. All others were in favor and the motion carried.

## 7. ORDER OF BUSINESS

### A. 17-CR-02 Harvard Blvd./Laurie Ln. Retail Development Concept Review

- **Location:** Southeast corner of Harvard Blvd. & Laurie Ln.
- **APN:** 102-0-221-01, -02, -03
- **Applicant:** Cardiff Development Partners (dba Canyon Cardiff Santa Paula)

- **Zoning:** C-G (General Commercial)
- **General Plan Designation:** Commercial
- **Staff Presentation:** James Mason, Deputy Planning Director

**A request to consider an application for the development of approximately 13,000 square feet of new retail space on 1.92 acres of General Commercial property at the 500 block of West Harvard Boulevard in the City of Santa Paula, California.**

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:**

**A concept review is a discussion-only meeting, whereby a project applicant or proponent seeks from the Planning Commission input and reaction to a development idea or concept. Therefore, no commitments or discretionary actions are made by the Planning Commission in a Concept Review meeting.**

(Note - a Concept Review is discussion-only, whereby a project applicant or proponent seeks feedback from the Planning Commission regarding a development idea or concept. Therefore, no commitments or discretionary actions were made by the Commissioners. Only general feedback was provided.)

Deputy Director Mason presented the item to the Commissioners, detailing the concepts proposed by Cardiff Development Partners of Westlake Village, CA (dba Cardiff Canyon Santa Paula.)

Rick Chancellor, applicant representative from Cardiff Development Partners, spoke on the possible merits of the project, including as many as 50 new jobs, increased sales tax revenue for the City, and an attractive development similar to the Starbucks previously done in town.

Mr. Chancellor stated that Cardiff finds the parking requirements for fast food restaurants (1 space per 45sf) in the City code to be too high and out of line with other cities, and hopes the Commissioners would consider lowering the requirements or allow for binding reciprocal parking agreements between the parcels, in order to avoid a "sea of asphalt."

Mr. Chancellor stated the project meets City landscaping requirements (at 21%) when considering the three parcels overall, rather than individually, which is the norm, and again asked for consideration when the project comes before the Commission.

Mr. Chancellor stated they are concerned with Public Works requirements which may prove onerous as well, but hopes the City will work with them to make the project work and finally develop the long-vacant parcel.

Chairman Ikerd stated he is pleased the parcel may finally be developed and hopes it will prove successful, though he noted there are already several car washes and a lube shop in town. He also warned there are already numerous markets and fast food on Harvard Blvd.

Mr. Chancellor responded that the proposed Waterdrops Car Wash is different in that it is a full-tunnel car wash that provides a good, cheap, and likely better wash than what is currently in town, and has other successful locations in the county. Waterdrops also recycles its water, unlike many other self-serve washes. Mr. Chancellor also stated that Santa Paula does not currently have a major-brand oil change shop like Jiffy Lube, and people may be more comfortable going to a national brand, rather than a local shop, which will keep more money in town.

Commissioner Sommer stated he is concerned about the nearby residences, and hopes the project designers and future businesses would be good stewards. He also stated he would not be in favor of another market, as there are already so many in town.

Vice Chairman Robinson stated he drove by the lot today and it is a fairly desolate area, even situated near the park. He asked if the developer had considered an entrance off of Harvard Blvd., rather than Laurie Ln.

Mr. Chancellor responded that people will need to drive in to the car wash off of Laurie Ln., as the size of the car wash necessitates its current situation on the lot.

Vice Chairman Robinson stated supports the project but is concerned the residents of Laurie Ln. may not like the increased traffic or turnarounds on their street, though traffic on Harvard Blvd. generally goes too fast for a safe entrance/exit on Harvard. He stated he is also concerned about the potential noise from the vacuum stations disturbing the residences.

Mr. Chancellor stated they did consider the noise of the vacuum stations, which is why they are situated along Harvard Blvd., farther away from the houses. The car wash tunnel would also block much of the vacuum noise. Mr. Chancellor stated he believes the ambient noise from traffic on Harvard Blvd. is already fairly loud.

Vice Chairman Robinson continued that there are already several car washes in town, albeit in varying states of decay. He stated town residents would likely welcome a modern, drive-thru lube shop. Vice Chairman Robinson also stated he likes the Starbucks the applicant did in town, though he had doubts about the design and parking in that plan when it came before the Planning Commission. Vice Chairman Robinson then stated his reservations about the possibility of adding another fast food restaurant in town, especially on Harvard Blvd., as there are already so many. He would much rather see a nice mid-range restaurant, along with a safer traffic situation nearby, as several pedestrians have been hit by vehicles.

Commissioner McPhail questioned why there are 25 vacuum bays in the car wash plans, as it seems excessive. He also shares Vice Chairman Robinson's concerns regarding the entrance and increased traffic on Laurie Ln., stating he would rather see the car wash flipped 180 degrees and have the entrance on Harvard Blvd. Commissioner McPhail stated he thinks Jiffy Lube is a good idea, however he frowns upon another market, and questions the viability of any food establishment placed on the same lot as two automotive businesses. He would also revisit the landscaping plan were the project to come back formally. His main concern, however, is traffic on Laurie Ln., though overall he is happy to see something proposed for this lot, as it has been vacant since his arrival in 1979.

Mr. Chancellor responded that they considered Commissioner McPhail's suggestion about flipping the car wash around, but this placed the vacuum bays too near the residences. Regarding the large number of vacuum bays, Mr. Chancellor stated they overcompensated to ensure there would always be a bay available when someone comes out of the car wash wanting to vacuum. Regarding the traffic situation, Mr. Chancellor stated the queue lane for the car wash is also overcompensated and very large, accommodating 16 cars at any time, which should eliminate any backup onto Laurie Ln., with one car going into the wash equaling one car out.

Chairman Ikerd asked how long it takes a car to go through the car wash.

Mr. Chancellor responded that the wash cycle takes approximately 3-5 minutes, typical of conveyor carwashes.

Chairman Ikerd stated that seems similar to the Costco car wash in Oxnard.

Regarding shared parking, Mr. Chancellor stated Jiffy Lube runs a clean operation, and should not adversely affect shared parking spaces (grease, oil, etc.) with other businesses. Additionally, Jiffy Lube generally closes around 5-7pm, meaning all those shared parking spaces would be available.

Commissioner Bangs stated she is happy to see the car wash uses recycled water. She stated she likes the modern and beautiful look of the Starbucks, and that Santa Paula could use more such places. She stated there seems to be a consensus that a market will not work, as it is oversaturated, and that another fast food restaurant will not keep people in town to eat. Commissioner Bangs continued that she would like to see a restaurant like a Baja Fresh go in - something not necessarily sit-down, but also not standard fast food fare - where families can go and eat together. She thinks the potential restaurant will also benefit from the proximity to the nearby park. Relatedly, she asked if there would be easy access from the park.

Deputy Director Mason responded that the City would want people from the park to access the restaurant via the sidewalk for safety reasons, and would encourage design and landscape plans that keep people from crossing the driveway and/or

landscape buffer to access the restaurant.

Chairman Ikerd suggested a Chinese restaurant, as there does not seem to be one in town anymore, wished the applicant good luck with a future submittal, and then closed the Order of Business item.

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>ADOPTED [UNANIMOUS]</b>
<b>EXCUSED:</b>	Robinson, Sommer, Ikerd, Bangs, McPhail

## 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 6:50pm.

Chairman Ikerd confirmed there are no Conflicts or Ex Parte Contacts with the Commissioners regarding the Public Hearing item.

### A. 17-MM-02 Airpark Project Extension

- **Location:** 1170 Montebello St. (APN: 104-0-107-095)
- **Applicant:** Stephen Wolpin (Three Fliers, LLC)
- **Zoning:** Airpark Specific Plan/Airport Safety Zone Overlay- Inner Safety Subzone (SP-7/KS-IS)
- **General Plan Designation:** Light Industrial
- **Environmental:** An Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) was prepared and adopted for the project pursuant to the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act.
- **Staff Presentation:** James Mason, Deputy Planning Director

**A request for a one-year extension to the previously approved Project No. 2013-CDP-09, Santa Paula Airpark, a proposed 37-unit residential airpark condominium project on a 6.79-acre parcel located at the eastern terminus of Santa Maria Street. Absent the request, Project No. 2013-CDP-09 (the "Project") will expire on June 24, 2017.**

#### **RECOMMENDED ACTION:**

**Staff recommends the Planning Commission select Alternative No. 1, adopting Resolution No. 3765 approving a one-year time extension of Project No. 2013-CDP-09, Santa Paula Airpark, a proposed 37-unit residential airpark condominium project on a 6.97-acre parcel located at the**



**eastern terminus of Santa Maria Street, which will expire on June 24, 2017, in order for the Project applicant and City staff to make necessary refinements and clarifications to the approval documents before the project is presented to the Planning Commission and City Council for final approval.**

Deputy Director Mason presented the item to the Commissioners, stating there have been several extensions already provided to this project, however the Applicant may request another, and staff supports, as this is an exciting project which will likely be good for Santa Paula. Additionally, the hope of both Applicant and staff is that the project will not need the full year to come back to hearing.

Robert Kwong, attorney and representative for the Applicant (Three Fliers, LLC), stated the project is a win-win for both his client and the City, as it will be a jewel for the airport, and reiterated Deputy Director Mason's statement that the Applicant is ready to roll and intends to move forward in less time than the one-year extension being requested tonight.

Chairman Ikerd stated he is glad to see this project coming back, as he supports such an exciting opportunity.

No other Commissioners had any comments.

Commissioner Sommer moved to select Alternative No. 1, adopting Resolution No. 3765 approving a one-year time extension of Project No. 2013-CDP-09, Santa Paula Airpark, a proposed 37-unit residential airpark condominium project on a 6.97-acre parcel located at the eastern terminus of Santa Maria Street, which will expire on June 24, 2017, in order for the Project applicant and City staff to make necessary refinements and clarifications to the approval documents before the project is presented to the Planning Commission and City Council for final approval. Commissioner McPhail seconded the motion. All were in favor under roll call vote, and the motion carried.

Chairman Ikerd closed the Public Hearing at 6:55pm.

<b>RESULT:</b>	<b>ADOPTED [UNANIMOUS]</b>
<b>MOVER:</b>	Michael Sommer, Commissioner
<b>SECONDER:</b>	W. Earl McPhail, Commissioner
<b>AYES:</b>	Robinson, Sommer, Ikerd, Bangs, McPhail

- Close Public Hearing

## 9. NEW BUSINESS

None.

## **10. CITY COMMUNICATIONS**

### **A. Planning Department**

Deputy Director Mason updated the Commissioners on the following projects:

Project #14-CDP-02, the Hardison House development by Williams Homes at 1226 Ojai Rd. that was previously approved by the Planning Commission, was revised as part of the legal settlement reached in the suit brought by the San Buenaventura/Santa Paula Conservancy. Revisions include downsizing the project to 36 homes, leaving the existing Hardison House and barn in place, relocating (rather than removing) the two smaller existing outbuildings on the property, and adding a sidewalk along Ojai Rd. that also accommodates a protected oak tree onsite. The revised project appeared before the City Council at their May 15th meeting, and was unanimously approved.

Project #16-CUP-06, the ZGlobal BESS (Battery Energy Storage System) project that appeared before the Planning Commission as a Concept Review in October 2016, is currently circulating the IS-MND for public review and will hold another outreach workshop in the near future. The deadline for written comments on the IS-MND is 5:00pm on Monday, June 12th.

Several Tentative Maps (Phase 2 and Phase 3) have been submitted by Limoneira-Lewis Community Builders for the ongoing Harvest at Limoneira/East Area 1 development.

Cal State Northridge students presented a report on Santa Paula tourism to the Planning Dept. and Chamber of Commerce, noting a severe lack of social media presence for the City, but also great potential as a location for affordable day trips.

(Note: a portion of the end of this discussion is inaudible on the recording.)

### **B. Planning Commission**

Deputy Director Mason welcomed Margaux Bangs and W. Earl McPhail, the City's two new Planning Commissioners, on behalf of the Planning Department and the City of Santa Paula. Ms. Bangs currently owns and operates a downtown small business, and will serve until July 2019. Mr. McPhail is a retired Ventura County Agricultural Commissioner, and will serve until May 2021. Both were appointed at the May 1, 2017 City Council meeting and sworn in as Commissioners by the City Clerk on May 4th. Both new Commissioners met with Planning staff last week to aid in the onboarding process.

Deputy Director Mason reviewed Planning Commission Rules of Procedure (Resolution No. 3497), whereby a Chair and Vice Chair are normally selected from the five-member panel by majority vote during December of each year. The 2017 selections were tabled during the last Planning Commission meeting of 2016, until the two vacant Commission seats could be filled. Chairman Ikerd and Vice

Chairman Robinson agreed to continue in their positions until such time. Deputy Director Mason explained that, although we have returned to a full complement of Commissioners, in light of the learning curve and number of significant projects in the pipeline, Staff suggests the current Chair and Vice Chair remain in their positions until this December's normal cycling. Chairman Ikerd and Vice Chairman Robinson agreed to remain in their positions until December, with no objections from Commissioners Bang, McPhail, or Sommer.

## **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 7:02pm.

**NOTICE:** Actions by the Planning Commission on the above items cannot be appealed to the City Council after 4:30 p.m. on **June 2, 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.