



Action Minutes
Planning Commission
Regular Meeting
7:00 p.m. - Thursday, June 27, 2013
City Council Chambers, 809 Center Street

Call to Order — 7:00 P.M.

Roll Call —

Present: R. Quartararo, Chair; M. Mesiti-Miller, Vice Chair; M. Primack; T. Goncharoff; M. Tustin
Absent: (with notice) P. Kennedy; J. Nortz.
Staff: Assistant Director, A. Khoury; Principal Planner, K. Thomas; Senior Planner, M. King; DCE consultant, B. Nobel; Senior Planner, R. Bane; Recorder, M. Schwarb.
Audience: 30-35

Statements of Disqualification — None.

Oral Communications — None.

No action shall be taken on these items.

The Chair may announce and set time limits at the beginning of each agenda item.

Announcements — None.

Public Hearings —

Old Business (continued from the meeting of 6/20/13)

1. **Ocean Street Area Plan** **A13-0007** **Ocean Street Corridor**
Adoption of the draft Ocean Street Area Plan and a Local Coastal Program amendment, consistent with the City's *General Plan 2030* that calls for development and improvement of the Ocean Street area. The Area Plan describes and illustrates a 20-year vision along Ocean Street through the year 2030, and provides a framework for creating a more welcoming environment along the corridor. The Area Plan includes policies and actions to supplement those in the General Plan, development and design standards and guidelines, and implementation steps to ensure a high quality of new development along the street, including streetscape enhancements and improved public access. (Environmental Review: Negative Declaration). (City of Santa Cruz, filed: 12/2010)
Recommendation: That the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council acknowledge the environmental determination and approve the Ocean Street Area Plan. (Environmental Review: Negative Declaration)

The Public Hearing was opened.

Speaking from the audience:

- Mary Ellen Boyle, a Central Park neighbor, with concerns about noise and cut-through traffic and a question regarding the alley behind May Avenue, thinks the plan is good;
- Karen Bohrk is excited about the plan, but has concerns about Jack-in-the-Box traffic and garbage, and worries about multiple story buildings;
- Ed Silveira with concerns about density, traffic and hotels serving alcohol. He thinks the plan needs more time;
- Daniel Joinser likes the plan, but has concerns about building heights, and noise;
- Douglass Weymouth thinks the architecture should mimic the City Hall, rather than the County Building and has concerns about heights and traffic;
- Lynn Clausen is in favor of beautification, but not at the expense of neighborhoods, and thinks a parking garage would be a good idea;
- Elisabeth Kadner lives in the Central Park neighborhood, and has concerns about cut-through traffic, Jack-in-the-Box trash, commercialization;
- Deborah Marks, a Central Park neighbor, brought over 40 signatures on a petition, and has concerns about many of the issues already noted.

The Public Hearing was closed.

Senior Planner King noted that the process started in 2006 and there has been a significant public input. She went on to say that the area plan is limited to the Ocean Street corridor, but understands that the implementation of the plan may have impacts on neighborhoods. She also noted that the Planning Commission had previously talked about adding language for the Council to consider regarding private parking, safety issues and potential design solutions; a specific policy added regarding new neighborhood gateway features such as traffic calming islands, and improved landscaping and signage. In regard to building heights she iterated that this is the time to create stronger language if desired since the height of two to four stories is already zoned and the concept was to create an incentive for private development in the corridor and if we decide we want to reduce heights development won't happen. As to the traffic issues, each project would be analyzed by Public Works and if more traffic is generated by the project, a traffic study would be required.

Commissioner Quartararo asked for a comparison of the Beach Area plan and the Ocean Street plan and Senior Planner King responded that the Beach Area plan was much more complicated since it was a part of the Coastal Zone and had to conform to the Local Coastal Plan. Also the beach area had a historic neighborhood that needed protection and specific building guidelines, the beach influence and is very complicated. The Ocean Street Area Plan is much simpler, and suggests ways to improve the corridor and is less specific.

Action Minutes

Commissioner Goncharoff asked about a letter to the Planning Commission from Mathew Thompson suggesting that Planned Developments in the Corridor be exempt from minimum square footage requirements currently in place. Principal Planner Thomas explained that parcels along the corridor are too small to do a mixed use project that the plan envisions, and property owners and developers need to assemble parcels to achieve larger, more creative projects. The next step of the Corridor Plan is to develop zoning ordinances and incentives to implement the plan. Consultant Ben Noble commented that when a Community relies on Planned Developments to achieve type of development that they want to see, it indicates the zoning is not working. Senior Planner King noted that a specific zoning ordinance is the next stage of the process so developers and the neighborhood will know what can be developed.

The Commissioners made comments and asked questions regarding:

- Alley right-of-ways;
- Planned Developments;
- Mechanical equipment;
- Conflict inherent in development ;
- Tourism;
- Signage for neighborhoods;
- River levee access and signage;
- Downtown and beach signage;
- Streetscape master plan;
- Sidewalk improvements;
- Traffic calming in neighborhoods;
- Streetscape master plan;
- Protection for neighborhoods;
- Potential parking garage;
- Step-backs adjacent to residential;
- Massing of buildings and design guidelines;
- Design guidelines for rear of building;
- Trash enclosures location;
- Leonard and May corner;
- Concerns about lower Ocean;
- Prioritizing a shared parking facility;
- Jack-in-the-Box trash as a code violation;
- Alcohol Use Permits.

ACTION: Commissioner Mesiti-Miller moved, and Commissioner Goncharoff seconded, that the Planning Commission recommended that the City Council acknowledge the environmental determination and approve the Ocean Street Area Plan with new language as noted in the staff report and with added language regarding neighborhood protections, as follows:

- Policy CD-O2.3 Require new development to minimize impacts relating to parking, loading, traffic, noise, mechanical equipment, and lighting on adjacent residential neighborhoods.
- Action CD-O2.3.1 Amend the Zoning Ordinance to establish new performance standards for commercial and mixed-use development located adjacent to single-family homes.
- Policy M-O2.2 Require that new development provides an appropriate amount of off-street parking that supports the use of transportation alternatives.
- Action M-O2.1 Require the preparation of a traffic impact analysis for new development in accordance with the criteria established by Public Works.
- B1.3.1 Design of loading and service areas should consider the balance between neighborhood impacts and public safety.
- B.4.1.3 Adequate screening shall be provided along the perimeter of any parking area adjacent to single-family homes. Screening may be in the form of a landscape buffer and/or an opaque wall or fence.
- Provide signage to visitors to the river levee only where appropriate visitor accommodations are provided.
- Change zoning of parcel at the Southeast corner of the two-four story block at the corner of Water and Ocean to one-three story designation.
- Opportunity site identified at the County government center lot be explored as a joint venture discussion between the City and County to provide a visitor serving facility with parking and other visitor opportunities such as retail.

The motion carried on a vote of 5-0-2, with Commissioners Goncharoff, Mesiti-Miller, Tustin, Primack and Quartararo in favor and Commissioners Nortz and Kennedy absent.

The Chairman called for a break at 8:55 p.m. and the Commission resumed at 9:10 p.m.

2. **2956 Mission Street** **CP13-0033** **APN 002-691-03**
Planned Development, Design and Coastal Permits for a four-story, 82-room hotel in the IG-P/CZ/SPO zoning district. (Environmental Determination: Mitigated Negative Declaration) (Santa Cruz Mission Hotel LP, owner/filed: 3/14/2013) **RB**

This project requires a Coastal Permit which is not appealable to the California Coastal Commission. Action taken at this meeting on the Coastal Permit may be appealed to the City Council utilizing the procedures noted below.

RECOMMENDATION: That the Planning Commission acknowledge the environmental determination and approve the Planned Development, Design Permit, and Coastal Permit based on the findings listed in the staff report.

Action Minutes

Assistant Director Khoury introduced Senior Planner Bane who presented the staff report. He noted that this site was previously approved for an 86-room hotel with underground parking that was not built.

The applicant, Rakesh Patel, spoke about the project and noted that the hotel will not serve alcohol and the conference room is small and will accommodate only small groups. He commented that the catch basin bubbler will drain to Moore Creek and that the extension of the sewer main would be very difficult.

Prakash Patel, partner in the management group, made comments regarding signage.

The Public Hearing was opened. Speaking from the audience:

- Jessica Bernhardt, Grandview Terrace resident, opposed to the project;
- David Sams, Grandview Terrace resident, with concerns about traffic, noise, crime;
- Dr. Theodore Goldstein, Grandview Terrace resident, opposed.

The Public Hearing was closed.

The Commissioners asked questions and made comments regarding:

- Signage visibility from Highway 1;
- The catch basin bubbler;
- Conference room;
- Parking;
- Ownership of the trees along Highway 1;
- Check-in and check-out times;
- Articulation at the rear of the building;
- Boutique hotels.

ACTION: Commissioner Goncharoff moved, and Commissioner Mesiti-Miller seconded, that the Planning Commission recommend that the City Council acknowledge the environmental determination and approve the Planned Development, Design Permit, and Coastal Permit and with staff's recommendation for signage as shown. The motion carried on a vote of 4-1-2 with Commissioner Tustin opposed, and Commissioners Nortz and Kennedy absent.

General Business — None.

Informational Items — None.

No action shall be taken on these items.

Subcommittee/Advisory Body Oral Reports — None.
No action shall be taken on these items.

- Chairperson's Report - None.
- Planning Department Report - None.

Items Referred to Future Agendas — None.

Adjournment — 10:10 P.M.

The next Planning Commission meeting will take place on July 18, 2013 in the City Council Chambers.

Any writing related to an agenda item for the open session of this meeting distributed to the Planning Commission less than 72 hours before this meeting is available for inspection at the City Planning Department, 809 Center Street, Room 107 or on the City's website www.cityofsantacruz.com. These writings will also be available for review at the Planning Commission meeting in the public review binder at the rear of the Council Chambers.

APPEALS - Any person who believes that a final action of this advisory body has been taken in error may appeal that decision to the City Council. Appeals must be in writing, setting forth the nature of the action and the basis upon which the action is considered to be in error, and addressed to the City Council in care of the City Clerk.

Appeals must be received by the City Clerk within ten (10) calendar days following the date of the action from which such appeal is being taken. An appeal must be accompanied by a five hundred dollar (\$500) filing fee, unless the item involves a Coastal Permit that is appealable to the Coastal Commission, in which case there is no fee.