CITY OF FILLMORE
250 CENTRAL AVENUE
FILLMORE, CA 93015

MAY 19, 2010
REGULAR MEETING
6:30 PM

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

No New Business will be Considered by the Planning Commission after the Hour of 11:00 p.m. unless a Majority of the Planning Commission Determines to Continue beyond that Hour.
Memorandums: Memorandums relating to agenda items are on file in the Planning Department. If you have questions regarding the agenda, you may call the Planning Dept. (805) 524-1500 ext. 113 or visit the Planning Dept. in City Hall for information. Materials related to an item on this agenda submitted to the Planning Commission after distribution of the agenda packet are available for public inspection in the Planning Dept. in City Hall during normal business hours.

AGENDA

ITEM	REFERENCE
1. CALL TO ORDER	
2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	
3. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS This is the opportunity for citizen presentations or comments not related to agenda items, but within responsibility of the Planning Commission (Please do not exceed 5 minutes per topic).	
4. CONSENT CALENDAR	
4a. Minutes of the February 17, 2010 Planning Commission Meeting.	**Copy**
4b. Minutes of the April 21, 2010 Planning Commission Meeting.	**Copy**
5. PUBLIC HEARINGS – NONE	
6. SCREENING	
6a. SCR 10-01, Screening for the rebuild of a Single Family Dwelling unit on a 3,750 square foot lot (25' x 150').	**Memo**

Location: 333 Mountain View St.
Zoning: Residential Low
Applicant: Bill Lindsay, PO Box 1025, Santa Paula, CA, 93061.

Purpose: Planning Commission to screen design options available for a 25' wide lot.
Recommendation: Provide direction to the Applicant.

7. REPORTS and COMMUNICATIONS **Oral**

7a. Community Development Director **Oral**

7b. Planning Commission

8. ADJOURNMENT

8a. The Planning Commission adjourns to the next regular scheduled Planning Commission meeting on June 16, 2010, 6:30 p.m., in the City Council Chambers, City of Fillmore, 250 Central Avenue, Fillmore, CA 93015.

Next Regular City Council Meeting
May 25, 2010

PLEASE NOTE: If you challenge the actions of the Planning Commission in court, you may be limited to raising only those issues you or someone else raised at the public hearing described in the public notice, or in written correspondence delivered to the Planning Commission at, or prior to, the public hearing (Calif. Gov't Code § 65009).

Any legal action by an applicant seeking to obtain judicial review of the Planning Commission's decision on a hearing listed on this agenda may be subject to the 90-day filing period of, and governed by, Code of Civil Procedure Section 1094.6

In compliance with Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the Planning Secretary at (805) 524-1500-113, 48 hours prior to the meeting in order for the City to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting. (28 CFR 35.102-35.104 ADA Title II)

PLANNING COMMISSION
CITY OF FILLMORE
250 CENTRAL AVENUE
FILLMORE, CA 93015

FEBRUARY 17, 2010
REGULAR MEETING
6:30 PM

MINUTES

6:34 p.m., Commissioner Vance Johnson asked the assembly to stand and recite the Pledge of Allegiance.

OATH OF ALLEGIANCE

6:35 p.m., City Clerk Clay Westling administered the Oath of Allegiance to Douglas Tucker, who was reappointed to the Planning Commission by Mayor Patti Walker (February 9, 2010 City Council Meeting).

CALL TO ORDER

6.35 p.m., Douglas Tucker called the Planning Commission meeting to order. Planning Commissioners present were: Chair Douglas Tucker, Vance Johnson and Diane McCall. Staff present were: Community Development Director Kevin McSweeney, City Attorney Theodore Schneider, City Engineer Tom Scott, Assistant Planner Manuel Minjares and Planning Secretary Denise Beauduy. Commissioners absent: Vice Chair Tom Fennell and Mark Austin (both excused).

ELECTIONS

Planning Commission Chair

It was moved by Commissioner Johnson and seconded by Commissioner McCall to nominate: Doug Tucker for Planning Commission Chair. Ayes: Johnson; McCall and Tucker. Noes: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Austin and Fennell. Motion Carried 3:0.

Planning Commission Vice Chair

It was moved by Commissioner Johnson and seconded by Commissioner Tucker to nominate Tom Fennell for Planning Commission Vice Chair. Ayes: Johnson, McCall and Tucker. Noes: None. Abstain: None Absent: Austin and Fennell. Motion Carried 3:0.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

There were no comments.

CONSENT CALENDAR – Approved.

The Consent Calendar consisted minutes of the January 20, 2010 regular scheduled Planning Commission meeting. It was moved and seconded to approve the Consent Calendar as submitted.. Motion: Second: . Ayes: Johnson, McCall and Tucker. Noes: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Austin; Fennell. Motion Carried 3:0.

PUBLIC HEARING

Santa Paula/Fillmore Greenbelt Agreement to be Adopted as a Greenbelt Ordinance (continued from December 9, 2009).

6:38 p.m., Chair Tucker announced the public hearing was open and continued from December 9, 2009. The report was presented by Community Development Director Kevin McSweeney. Mr. McSweeney provided background information about the greenbelt. M. McSweeney stated Ventura County has a planning philosophy for land conservation by keeping agriculture or greenbelts between cities so the cities do not merge together and resemble Orange County or the San Fernando Valley. Mr. McSweeney said the Williamson Act, SOAR, CURB, the Guidelines to Orderly Development, Sphere of Influence and City Limit boundaries have been established to preserve agriculture. Another method of preserving agriculture, said Mr. McSweeney, is to create a greenbelt. The City of Fillmore entered into an agreement with City of Santa Paula in 1980 to form a greenbelt boundary from the west of Fillmore to Santa Paula and it the agreement has been renewed several times. Mr. McSweeney said the City of Fillmore also has a Greenbelt Agreement with Piru which was adopted by ordinance. The Fillmore/Piru Greenbelt is from the east end of Fillmore to the Los Angeles County Line. Mr. McSweeney spoke about uses, such as mining and airports; etc, that could be proposed for greenbelt areas and are not consistent with agriculture. Mr. McSweeney said those types of uses would go through an enhanced review, conditions would be added and a monitoring program would be imposed. Mr. McSweeney stated Fillmore is surrounded by greenbelt: 72,000 acres to the east and 32,000 acres to the west and through the existing agreement with Santa Paula, it is permitted to encroach into greenbelt as long as each city agrees. Mr. McSweeney said the City of Santa Paula would like to extend (by 500 acres) into the greenbelt to accommodate a proposed residential development, and the community of Santa Paula supports the encroachment, by vote of the citizens. LAFCO would not accept the application from the City of Santa Paula unless the City of Fillmore was in agreement with the application. Mr. McSweeney said the City Council provided direction for a subcommittee to be formed and review the request to encroach into the greenbelt. Mr. McSweeney gave the Greenbelt Subcommittee's recommendation for the City of Fillmore to adopt an ordinance with the City of Santa Paula and with the County of Ventura. Mr. McSweeney said 216 acres will be added to the greenbelt in the Santa Paula area located south of the Santa Clara River. The public hearings for the greenbelt have been continued several times because of concerns about future amendments to the greenbelt and what the process would be to approve an amendment. Mr. McSweeney said the Fillmore members of the Greenbelt subcommittee are strongly in favor of preserving the greenbelt and would like to make it difficult annex property by requiring a four-fifths (4/5) vote from the cities of Fillmore and Santa Paula and the Board of Supervisors. The Greenbelt subcommittee (Fillmore and Santa Paula members) is also asking for an enhanced review for eight land use categories that are permitted but may be inconsistent with the greenbelt. The County was not in favor of an enhanced review. Mr. McSweeney stated the City of Santa Paula has adopted a Greenbelt Ordinance and the Planning Commission will adopt a resolution recommending the City Council adopt a Greenbelt Ordinance tonight. Mr. McSweeney stated that all three ordinances do not contain the same language and the Planning Commission may also recommend the City Council address the issues of the Greenbelt Ordinance and provide direction with regard to the different agreements and 4/5 vote versus the technical advisory committee. The City Council will make the decision.

Questions and Comments

Commissioner McCall asked if additional acreage to the greenbelt was coming from Fillmore, and does the Greenbelt Ordinance have an expiration date. Referring to Exhibit A, Map No. 2, Mr. McSweeney responded some of the additional acreage will come from the Sespe Creek River bottom; it is not stated in the Greenbelt Resolution. The County is indicating it is their desire to add the river bottom to the greenbelt; it is not productive agriculture and no construction can occur. Mr. McSweeney stated the City Engineer does not want to lose the ability to do an emergency clean out of the river. The consensus of the Greenbelt Committee was emergency clean out is not an issue. Mr. McSweeney said the ordinance will not expire; it allows for future amendments by the technical advisory committee.

Commissioner Johnson asked who will do the annual review. Mr. McSweeney responded City staff will do the annual review and present it City Council as an action item.

Commissioner Tucker recommended inserting language into the ordinance: 1) that Fillmore retains the right to dredge the river during an emergency. 2) Keep the 4/5 vote. 3) Keep the technical advisory committee. Commissioner Tucker commented that while the ordinance is a City of Fillmore ordinance, it refers to three different jurisdictions, and the language referring to tiles, i.e.; City Clerk or Council, is not clear or specific as to which city the clerk or council the ordinance is referring to.

Mr. Schneider said City staff could clarify the language. The ordinance before the Commission tonight is the same ordinance that was created and adopted by the City of Santa Paula. This ordinance is different from the ordinance the County is considering adopting.

Mr. McSweeney said there were no comments about the enhanced review, it is written in the text. Mr. McSweeney said he would like the Council to address it; all three ordinances should read the same.

City Attorney Schneider informed the Commission that they do not have to recommend adoption of an ordinance, if they feel that the Greenbelt Agreement and resolution we have in place now is the best way to protect the greenbelt.

Commissioner Johnson stated the ordinance is consistent with City Council goals. The 72,000 acres to the east is the only Greenbelt Ordinance in the county. It has been a long-term goal to establish a greenbelt ordinance to the west of Fillmore.

The consensus of the Commission was strongly in favor of adopting a Greenbelt Ordinance.

Mr. Schneider said that since the City of Fillmore has to agree to the annexation, there is room to negotiate and compromise on other issues in order to have a greenbelt ordinance.

Commissioner Johnson said he was in favor of the 4/5 vote, and the technical advisory committee. Commissioner Johnson reiterated that a Greenbelt Ordinance to the west would be consistent with the Council's long term goals, and he is willing to give on other issues to have a Greenbelt Ordinance adopted.

7:03 p.m., Chair Tucker and invited public comment. There were no speakers. Chair Tucker closed the public hearing.

ACTION
Planning Commission Resolution No. 10-844 was adopted, recommending City Council adopt a Greenbelt Ordinance.

It was moved by Commissioner Tucker and Seconded by Commissioner McCall to adopt Planning Commission Resolution 10-844, and wordsmith language to recommend adoption of technical advisory committee, enhanced review and 4/5ths majority. Ayes: Johnson, McCall and Tucker. Noes: None. Abstain: None. Absent: Austin and Fennell. Motion Carried 3:0.

REPORTS AND COMMUNICATIONS
7:05 p.m., Mr. McSweeney gave a brief report.

Mr. McSweeney said the annual City Council goals session was held last night. The top goals were: boost the economy, public safety, engage the community and define Fillmore. The City Council acknowledged the City Manager's weekly report and said it was very informative.

Mr. McSweeney Planning staff has been working on the Housing Element the latest draft will go before the City Council next Tuesday.

Regarding the City Council goals, Commissioner Johnson commented the goal to define Fillmore sounds like it relates to Vision 2020 and a simple definition is in the General Plan.. Mr. McSweeney said the last best small town in Southern California says it all.

ADJOURNMENT – 7:12 PM
There being no further business to come before the Planning Commission, the meeting was adjourned to the next regular Planning Commission Meeting scheduled for March 17, 2010, 6:30 p.m. in the City Council Chambers, 250 Central Avenue, Fillmore, CA 93015.

_____
Denise Beauduy
Planning Secretary

PLANNING COMMISSION
CITY OF FILLMORE
250 CENTRAL AVENUE
FILLMORE, CA 93015

APRIL 21, 2010
REGULAR MEETING
6:30 PM

MINUTES

CALL TO ORDER

6:30 p.m., Chair Douglas Tucker called the Planning Commission meeting to order, and Commissioner Johnson led the assembly in the Pledge of Allegiance. Planning Commissioners present were: Chair Douglas Tucker, Vice Chair Tom Fennell and Vance Johnson. Staff present were: Community Development Director Kevin McSweeney, City Attorney Theodore Schneider, and Planning Secretary Denise Beauduy. Absent (excused): Commissioner Diane McCall.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

There were no comments.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The Consent Calendar consisted minutes of the February 17, 2010. Commissioners Austin and Fennell were absent for the February meeting. The item was tabled to the next meeting on May 19, 2010.

HOUSING ELEMENT UPDATE

6:35 p.m., Mr. McSweeney presented the report stating the Planning Commission reviewed the second draft of the Housing Element and recommended City Council approval. The City Council reviewed the second draft and had additional comments. Mr. McSweeney said staff will prepare a third draft of the Housing Element that will be reviewed only by the City Council. Since the North Fillmore Specific Plan was reduced from 700 to 350 units, said Mr. McSweeney, the remaining units must be accommodated else where in the city. Mr. McSweeney said Planning staff identified sites that could accommodate the 350 units and requested a Zoning Ordinance amendment to change the densities for residential medium from 11 to 15 units per acre and residential medium-high from 15 units to 35 units per acre. The sites identified by Planning staff were three separate parcels, but the City Council indicated there were too many units for three sites and directed Planning staff to identify alternative areas, through out the city, to accommodate 350 units. Mr. McSweeney said staff has identified 14 sites that could accommodate those units, and the information will be presented to the City Council the latter part of May. Mr. McSweeney said a third and final draft of the Housing Element will be prepared, and it will be reviewed and considered by the Planning Commission as a public hearing with an environmental document. The Planning Commission will make a recommendation to the City Council and the City Council will begin their public hearings. After the public hearings, the Housing Element will go to the State for certification. Mr. McSweeney said the process for the Housing Element will take approximately 8 – 9 months because there are significant land use changes.

Commissioner Austin posed several questions about the North Fillmore Specific Plan: 1) When will the revised North Fillmore Specific Plan document come before the Commission? 2) Who will pay for the revised document and how much will it cost? 3) Will the there be a new environmental document?

Mr. McSweeney responded that Planning staff completed the RFP, and it was approved by the City Council; however, Planning staff was directed to work on other projects, such as the Housing Element, which took priority over the North Fillmore Specific Plan. Mr. McSweeney said a line item will be created for the North Fillmore Specific Plan document in the budget for the next fiscal year.

Regarding the cost for the document, Mr. McSweeney said the City will incur the expense; staff estimates $125,000.00. Mr. McSweeney said the approved environmental document could be used with an addendum depending on the changes that are made to the plan.

Commissioner Austin asked if the 350 units are part of the units that are calculated in the Housing Element, and what will happen if those units are not constructed. Mr. McSweeney said 350 units designated for North Fillmore will remain as planned. The other 350 units must be distributed somewhere else in the city.

Commissioner Tucker asked if the 350 units had to be distributed within the Redevelopment Agency area. Mr. McSweeney responded the units did not have to be within the Redevelopment Area or within the city limits. The units could be planned within the Sphere of Influence, but we could not plan for the units to be located beyond the Sphere of Influence.

HERITAGE VALLEY PARKS SPECIFIC PLAN UPDATE

6:42 p.m., Mr. McSweeney gave a power point presentation as he summarized the document. Mr. McSweeney stated the Heritage Valley Parks Specific Plan area consists of 300 acres of which 150 acres are planned and will be developed in three phases. Griffin Industries created a specific plan along with three separate Tract Maps and Development Permits for the subdivision known as the "Bridges." The Specific Plan was approved in October 2002 and it consisted of: a land use element; ten acre elementary school site; community park and trails; community facility building; debris basin. Mr. McSweeney said the project was approved for 750 residential units of various architectural styles and amenities such as porches, court yard and outdoor living spaces. The project also has a variety of lot sizes. The smaller lots were intended for paired housing known as the Villas; the larger lots range from 8,000 square feet – 10,000 square feet. The street design, for the project, is a grid pattern. Phase 1a and Phase 1b are located on west side of pole creek; Phase 2 is located on the east side of Pole Creek. Mr. McSweeney indicated the site is located adjacent to the Santa Clara River and the developer was required to construct a levee. The levee is a soil cement levee that is buried approximately eight feet deep, and it resembles a landscaped berm with a trail system on top of the levee that connects to the regional bike path and the Santa Paula Branch Line.. Mr. McSweeney said the Community Park is lower than the levee because it was designed to act as a drain during a storm event. Mr. McSweeney the Planning Commission and City Council were concerned with aesthetics and the developer incorporated outdoor living spaces within the project and gateway features, which include fountains and two green bridges. Mr. McSweeney said the bridges are located on Mountain View and they have become the subject of many photographs. Mr. McSweeney spoke about the Pole Creek Debris Basin saying that it has doubled in size since

the original proposal. Mr. McSweeney indicated the developer met with the Ventura County Watershed Protection District to ensure the debris basin met the design criteria for major storm events. Because of the modification to the Pole Creek Debris Basin, the developer had to remove 37 residential units. Mr. McSweeney said the most of Phase 1a has been constructed, but Griffin Industries has sold the project to Hearthstone, an investment group that has selected another developer, Landstone Development, for the next phase; however, Hearthstone may sell portions of the project to another developer to complete the project.

REPORTS and COMMUNICATIONS
Mr. McSweeney gave an update on the following projects:

Screening – the Planning Commission will review a screening for an infill residential proposal at the May 19 meeting.

Greenbelt Ordinance – the City Council approved the Greenbelt Ordinance and the language in the ordinance is exactly the same language that is in the Santa Paula Greenbelt Ordinance. The Ventura County Board of Supervisors will consider the Greenbelt Ordinance in June. Mr. McSweeney stated Santa Paula removed 500 acres from the greenbelt and 216 acres were added.

Educational Training – Commissioner Tucker said there is a lull in development activity which presents the opportunity for educational training. Mr. McSweeney said staff could make presentations as a form of updating the Commission on projects. Commissioner Austin suggested a CEQA presentation from a practitioner's standpoint.

ADJOURNMENT – 6:55 PM
There being no further business to come before the Planning Commission, the meeting was adjourned to the next regular Planning Commission Meeting scheduled for May 19, 2010, 6:30 p.m. in the City Council Chambers, 250 Central Avenue, Fillmore, CA 93015.

_____
Denise Beauduy
Planning Secretary

THIS PAGE IS INTENTIONALLY BLANK

CITY OF FILLMORE
CENTRAL PARK PLAZA
250 Central Avenue
Fillmore, California 93015-1907
(805) 524-3701 • FAX (805) 524-5707

May 19, 2010

TO: Planning Commission

THROUGH: Kevin McSweeney, Community Development Director

FROM: Manuel Minjares, Assistant Planner

SUBJECT: Screening 10-01 – Request that the Planning Commission Review and Provide Comments on the Screening Application for the Rebuilding of a Single Family Dwelling on a 25 Foot Wide Lot.

SUMMARY:

The applicant has recently demolished an uninhabited, red tagged single family dwelling at 333 Mountain View Street and has submitted a Screening Application to obtain comments from the Planning Commission on re-developing the property. Prior to the submittal of the Screening Application, the Staff Review Committee (SRC) reviewed three different site plan configurations and provided comments to the applicant. The SRC was primarily concerned with the narrow width (25') of the lot and providing off street parking.

RECOMMENDATION:

1. Staff recommends the Planning Commission provide the applicant with comments and insight on the two site plan alternatives and building elevations.

BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS:

The Residential Low (RL) zoned property is constrained by its width, property size and lack of access to a rear alley. The property measures 25' in width by approximately 150' in length for a total area of approximately 3,750 sq. ft. These dimensions are far under the minimum development standards for lot width (50') and lot area (6,000 sq. ft.) within the RL zone. Further complicating matters is the minimum side setback requirement of 10' (can be reduced to 5' with Fire Department approval) for dwelling units. Finally, Zoning Ordinance Section 6.04.3415(1), Off Street Parking Standards indicates that a two car garage is required for the development of a single-family detached dwelling. The placement of a two-car garage also becomes problematic in terms of meeting the set back requirement of 3' from each property line and the minimum unobstructed interior width requirement of 20'.

Given the physical size restraints of the property, the applicant can apply for a Variance to reduce required setback requirements.

Planning Staff identified these issues and recommended that the applicant submit three site plan alternatives for SRC to review.

Staff Review Committee Review

The SRC reviewed three conceptual site plans, elevations and floor plan on April 20, 2010. The major concerns of SRC included off-street parking, setbacks to adjacent structures and the aesthetics of the proposed dwelling. The SRC made the following comments:

1. Off-street parking - SRC members were split between the site plan layout that included a 2-car garage in the rear of the property and a site plan layout that included a 40 long driveway in front of the dwelling. Staff asked that the applicant look into a shared driveway scenario with the southerly adjacent property to allow a realistic building footprint with sufficient access to a two-car garage in the rear of the property.

2. The SRC prefers a site layout that provides off-street parking while remaining compatible to the surrounding neighborhood with special consideration to the Conservation/Preservation overlay district.

3. SRC asked that the applicant show the footprint of the adjacent structures on the site plan. Staff was concerned with the close proximity from the proposed dwelling to the existing dwelling unit to the north.

4. Engineering staff was concerned with the potential for lot-to-lot drainage and requested that the applicant show the proposed storm water run-off flow on the site plan.

5. Engineering staff requested that a soils report prepared by a licensed geotechnical engineer with recommendations for project construction be submitted along with the planning permit application, prior to plan check.

6. The site plan needs to show that new irrigation, sod and designated street tree are to be installed within the parkway fronting the project.

7. On—site utilities are required to be installed underground.

8. The applicant will be conditioned to install a new water meter.

9. The applicant will be conditioned to install a 6" illuminated address light fixture.

The outline above is not all inclusive of the comments staff will have once a complete Development Permit application is submitted.

Analysis

Taking SRC comments into account, Site Plan option B would seem to be the design scenario that addresses SRC's concerns with and off-street parking and site aesthetics while allowing the applicant to rebuild the dwelling to its former building envelope. The applicant would need to procure an access agreement with the property owner to the south and submit said agreement to the Planning Department with their Planning Permit application for a Development Permit to rebuild the demolished dwelling to its former building envelope and a Variance for a reduction to the setback requirement from 3' to 2' for the two car garage.

Options/Alternatives

1. Rebuild to previous footprint, no off-site parking.
2. Rebuild to previous footprint, provide 40' long driveway in front setback than will allow for parking. Option A on enclosed site plan.
3. Procure access agreement from southerly adjacent neighbor, construct 2-car garage. Option B on enclosed site plan.
4. Procure access agreement from southerly adjacent neighbor, construct one-car garage.
5. Provide one-car garage in front of dwelling.

FISCAL IMPACT:

No anticipated fiscal impact

Prepared By:

Manuel Minjares,
Assistant Planner
Planning Department

Reviewed By:

Kevin McSweeney,
Community Development Director
Planning Department

Attachment 1: Site Plans, Floor Plan, Elevation