

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING  
OF THE LOMPOC PLANNING COMMISSION  
April 12, 2004**

ROLL CALL: Commissioner Jack Rodenhi  
Commissioner Ralph Harman  
Commissioner Ed Shoemaker  
Commissioner Ron Fink

ABSENT: Commissioner Ann Ruhge

STAFF: Community Development Director Arleen Pelster  
Assistant City Attorney Matt Granger  
Assistant Planner Keith Neubert  
Staff Assistant Angela Wynne

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

On a motion by Commissioner Fink and seconded by Commissioner Shoemaker, the Minutes of the March 8, 2004 were corrected and approved on a voice vote of 4-0-0 with Commissioner Ruhge absent.

**ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:**

None.

**CONSENT CALENDAR:**

(All items listed under Consent Calendar are considered to be routine and will be enacted by one motion in the form listed below. There will be no separate discussion of these items unless good cause is shown prior to the time the Commission votes on the motion to adopt.)

**PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

**1. DR 02-11 – DEVELOPMENT PLAN AMENDMENTS**

A request by Madeline Pedego, the property owner, for Planning Commission consideration of a proposal to amend the original Development Plan (DR 02-11) for a 9-unit apartment complex. The amendments include changes to the approved colors, elimination of private yards and perimeter fencing, and changes to the proposed landscaping. The project is located at 213 East College Avenue (Assessor Parcel Number: 87-132-05) and is zoned High Density Residential (R-3). This action is exempt pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

Assistant Planner Keith Neubert summarized the written report.

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

Public Hearing opened at 6:45 p.m.

Public Hearing closed at 7:00 p.m.

Madeline Pedego , property owner/developer. Ms. Pedego indicated that this is her first development and she was not aware that a color change required City approval. She stated that the roof color change was made after more research was performed. The change in landscape is due to the fact that the project is located adjacent to the Community Center and a green belt area. Ms. Pedego indicated that the removal of fencing from the initial plan was a beneficial safety feature. She noted that the project's architectural appeal is exceptional and that the added enhancements resulted in more landscaping, beautifying the building. She stated that the stucco would be an adobe taupe with white trim and trellis. With the removal of fencing, more colorful landscape will be visible. Ms. Pedego indicated that there was a deviation initially with the grading of the project. She noted that Building B compliments the existing neighboring structures. She stated that building appears 'upscale' and is attempting to focus on a town house look rather than an apartment look project. She submitted her proposed revision to the landscape plans.

Commissioner Rodenhi commented that this meeting might not be a good forum to consider landscape changes because the changes had not been reviewed by staff.

Ms. Pedego stated her plans to forward the landscape changes to Parks and Urban Forestry Manager, Cindy McCall.

W. R. Dildine. Mr. Dildine stated that this project violates state law regarding the roofing of this project. He sympathized with the applicant in attempting to meet budget figures. Mr. Dildine noted that a recently completed project had to abide by the conditions and approvals of the City. He disagrees with the project's new fencing proposal and stated that there is not a screened area for resident's private items. He indicated that changing the color aspect after the roof has been applied is unacceptable. Mr. Dildine supports the staff's recommendation for denial of the changes and does not think that the conditions should be granted.

Hank Waterworth. Mr. Waterworth stated that there was a mistake with changing the roof color and noted that there are no structural changes to the project. He indicated that the applicant took the time to research the project for enhancement purposes. Mr. Waterworth stated that the attempt to upgrade the

project is for aesthetic reasons, not structural and that the request for these changes to the color seems to be reasonable.

### **Public Hearing Closed.**

Commissioner Rodenhi questioned staff as to what was approved and what project aspects have changed. Assistant Planner Keith Neubert responded. Commissioner Fink commented that the project would not have been approved by the Planning Commission if it had originally been submitted with these changes, stating that roofs are to be the same color as the structure for multi-family buildings (referring to page 2 of the staff report). He indicated that color is a common element and unifies architectural features. Commissioner Fink discussed conditions of private open space and stated that he would support a change of building color but that the roof must match. Commissioner Shoemaker asked if barbeque areas were to be removed. Assistant Planner Keith Neubert stated that the picnic table and the barbeque area would remain. Commissioner Harman discussed changes to the proposed resolution in order to accommodate a motion, if the Planning Commission were to approve a change to the color of the stucco. Commissioner Shoemaker, responding to the applicant's statement of financial investment, stated that a change this late in a project is not appropriate. He indicated that the standard should not be changed to support the proposed project changes. Commissioner Fink indicated that he does not have a problem with approving a change in the color of the stucco.

It was moved by Commissioner Fink that the Planning Commission deny the proposed amendments to the approved Development Plan (DR 02-11) for a 9-unit apartment complex at 213 East College Avenue (Assessor Parcel Number 87-132-05) based on the Findings of Fact in the Resolution; that the coloring of the stucco and fascia boards can be re-addressed to the Planning Commission for approval; and that the landscape changes be received by the Urban Forester.

There was a brief discussion amongst the Planning Commission of what specifically is to be voted upon. Commissioner Fink withdrew his motion. Commissioner Shoemaker commented that landscape plans are usually changed as projects progress. He stated that roof color changes cannot be changed toward the latter phase of the project. Commissioner Harman agreed with Commissioner Shoemaker. Commissioner Harman discussed the multiple changes to the project.

On a motion made by Commissioner Harman, seconded by Commissioner Fink, the Planning Commission adopted Resolution No. 341 (04) denying the proposed amendments to the approved Development Plan (DR 02-11) for a 9-unit apartment complex at 213 East College Avenue (Assessor Parcel Number 87-132-05) based on the Findings of Fact in the Resolution. The motion passed on a roll call vote of 4-0-1 with Commissioner Ruhge absent.

Community Development Director Arleen Pelster stated the procedure to appeal decisions. Ms. Pedego stated that she did not intend to offend the Commission with her ignorance of City procedures.

**NEW BUSINESS:**

None

**ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:**

Mr. Dildine commented that some community members would be pleased with the Commission's decision regarding the 213 East College Avenue project.

**WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS:**

None.

**DIRECTOR/STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:**

Community Development Director Arleen Pelster indicated that the May 10, 2004 agenda may be lengthy and that she will not be able to attend that meeting. There was discussion of the possibility to move the meeting to Wednesday, May 12, 2004. Staff will notify the Commission of any meeting date changes.

**COMMISSION REQUESTS:**

Commissioner Fink attended the 2004 Planners Conference in Monterey, California March 31-April 2, 2004 and stated that the California League of Cities plans to distribute a CD ROM of the conference presentations to each attendee and he plans to share the copy with other interested Commissioners. He highlighted and briefly discussed the following:

- All new projects must include fiber optic cable so that residences and businesses can connect to the new broadband system the City is developing;
- Major project (housing, business park, industrial, etc.) staff reports should be posted on the City website a week or so prior to the meeting to get better public input to the process. The Council uses this effectively, so the capability is currently available;
- New housing developments (100 or more units) should include walking paths that lead to something (like a pocket park, meeting patio or exercise area) – not just sidewalks;

- Never allow another project like the one on the north side of the Elk's. The 5-foot rear yard setback should be reviewed and changed to 15-20 feet to allow some space for kids to play safely;
- Should require 'green development' and certified 'green' contractors for future municipal, industrial/business and housing/apartment projects. There is software available to evaluate developments to quantify energy savings. 'Green' contractors use construction methods that reduce waste material and save space in the landfill. These techniques eventually reduce the cost of construction and operation of the building while conserving resources;
- Encourage/demand 'traffic calming' in residential developments. Traffic circles instead of stop signs, narrowed streets and slightly raised crosswalks will slow traffic;
- Revisit the distribution of the 'CC' (convenience center) zoning with the suggestion that at least one parcel in each 100-unit or larger project should receive this zoning to improve the concept of neighborhood.

Commissioner Shoemaker referred to a recent article in the Lompoc Record about the Master Plan of Riverbend Park. He stated that green grass is needed on the field and that the plan needs to be completed. Commissioner Rodenhi stated that there is a joint meeting with the Lompoc City Council and the Parks and Recreation Commission. For the record, Commissioner Harman clarified that the project north of the Elks Club was originally denied by the Planning Commission, later approved by the City Council, and routed back to the Planning Commission.

**NUMBER OF PEOPLE IN ATTENDANCE: 4**

**ADJOURNMENT:**

On a motion by Commissioner Shoemaker and seconded by Commissioner Fink, the meeting was adjourned 7:40 p.m.

---

Arleen T. Pelster, AICP  
Secretary

G: Minutes\2004\ 04-12-04  
aw

---

Jack Rodenhi  
Chair