

VALLEY CENTER PLANNING COMMISSION

DRAFT MINUTES

7:00 P.M., Tuesday, September 27, 2011
Valley Center City Hall at 121 S. Meridian Avenue

Chairman Janzen called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. with the following members present: Gary Janzen, Danny Park, Jaque Davis, John Dailey, Kathryn Schroeder, Dee Wretberg, and Ricky Shellenbarger.

Planning Commission member absent: Steve Jackson and Don Bosken
Staff Present: Warren Utecht, Community Development Director

MINUTES OF August 23, 2011 REGULAR MEETING

The minutes of the August 23rd. meeting were inadvertently left out of the packet but distributed the night of the meeting. It was generally agreed that the minutes would not be approved until the next Planning Commission meeting. Danny Park noted that the minutes show him present at the meeting but he was not in attendance. Warren will change the attendance record.

COMMUNICATIONS:

A. ITEMS BY THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR

- a. **500 N. Park Property Memo.** It was brought to the Community Director's attention that the mortgage Company that owns the dilapidated structure at 500 N. Park Avenue could not be reached, and that the condition of this home continues to deteriorate. After conducting research on the internet and making a number of phone calls, contact was made with the responsible party. The contact person explained that the mortgage company cannot place the house on the market because of foreclosure laws passed by congress.

- b. A copy of the Planning Commission/Site Plan Committee members was in the packet. Additions and corrections were made at the meeting.

C. Site Plan Review Committee-DRAFT OF August 12, 2011 meeting minutes. Warren recommended that these minutes be discussed in conjunction with the Zoning Ordinance Site Plan discussion.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None

CONSENT AGENDA

None

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None

NEW BUSINESS

A. Three Lot Splits on Cottonwood Drive Petitioned by Isham Alexander L.L.C.

Warren indicated that the zoning setbacks are acceptable (subject to zoning ordinance amendments that clarify lot width). Other Approval Guidelines as specified in Article 9, section 101 (Approval Guidelines) have been reviewed against these three lots and have been found to be consistent with the intent of these guidelines.

Motion was made and seconded that the three lot splits on Cottonwood Drive that involve the division of lots 2 and 3 of Block A, Valley Creek Estates 2nd, and Lot 10, Block B, Valley

Creek Estates 2nd, as illustrated on the attached maps, be approved. Motion carried unanimously.

B. Continuation of the discussion of the zoning regulation changes.

Warren went through the first half of the Zoning Regulations that were previously discussed, covering the issues that were questioned at the previous meeting. They included the following:

1. Definition of Adult Care Home (taken directly from the state statutes) on page 5
2. Definition of Child Care Facilities and Community Based Group Boarding Homes (taken directly from the state statutes) on page 9-10
3. Definition of General Motion Picture Theatre on page 14 (suggested by John Dailey)
4. Deletion of Residential Center definition on bottom of page 20. Some questions were raised regarding the definition of rehabilitation homes (definition just before Residential Center). Locations were given of possible rehabilitation homes. Warren will research them to determine how they are licensed.
5. Vision Triangle regulations on page 37-38 (carried over from Article 11.08 with modifications). This regulation is found elsewhere in the municipal code. This section will now avoid having to find the definition elsewhere. Language was added to address vision corners in areas of the city that have speed limits of 30 miles and hour or less (previously not addressed).
6. New Wind Energy Conversion System regulations on pages 38-42. Warren pointed out some changes that would improve the regulations.

New topics that were discussed were as follows:

1. A minimum rear yard for accessory structures is now 5 feet. It was discussed that this minimum setback be increased to 10 feet for two reasons. Many times utility easements are on the back 6 to 10 feet of a lot. If a utility company had to work in the easement, accessory structures could be in the way. Second reason came from FEMA standards that encourage a 10 feet clearance on the back lot line to allow the unimpeded flow of stormwater runoff. If someone has an existing accessory structure within 5 feet of the rear lot line and wanted to rebuild or add on in the same place, they could apply for a variance. The Planning Commission supported the change.
2. In the new R-2 and R-3 minimum lot width language "If a lot is split with zero lot line, 35 feet" was added to address "duplex units being split under condominium ownership situations. An example is the duplex units being built on Cottonwood.
3. John Dailey raised the issue that the Manufactured Home Park District purpose statement should include manufactured home parks that would be capable of being served with both public sewer and water. Warren concurred and will insert the language.
4. In the Downtown Neighborhood District, the word "Overlay" will be added, the phrase "Prohibited Permitted" uses will be changed to "Permitted uses that are prohibited in the Overlay District", and "Clubs and Taverns" will be removed from the "Special Uses that are Prohibited" in the Overlay District so that they can be allowed.
5. Confusing language in the storage of recreational vehicle section of the ordinance was revised to require no long term recreational vehicle storage within the front yard setback.
6. The sign code was amended to delete wording that would allow nonconforming portable signs to exist without time limitations.
7. With concurrence from the Site Plan Committee, the following items summarize the major changes to the Site Plan chapter of the Zoning Ordinance and the "Additional Site Plan Criteria" policy:
 - a. Both the Zoning Ordinance and the "Additional Site Plan Criteria" had administrative process language that contained inconsistencies. To avoid confusion, the administrative process for making an application for site plan

review was refined and more detail added in the zoning text and eliminated from the "Additional Site Plan Criteria" document.

- b. Most of the original criteria will remain in the "Additional Site Plan Criteria" document, but the two step (preliminary and final) review process was eliminated.
- c. More emphasis is being placed on the city staff working out site plan details with the petitioner.
- d. Once the staff is satisfied that sufficient information has been included on the site plan, a Site Plan Committee would be scheduled.
- e. Once the Site Plan Committee is satisfied, a recommendation would be forwarded to the Plan Commission for their review and action.

A motion was made seconded to recommend to the Council the revised Zoning Regulations and Site Plan Criteria Policy. Motion was unanimously approved.

E. Re-addressing tenant spaces fronting N. Ash Avenue at 226 W. Main Street

Warren described the situation that involves a commercial building with an address of 226 W. Main Street, located on the northeast corner of W. Main Street and N. Ash Avenue. This one story building has been divided into a number of offices identified as "Suites". The main entrance to the "Suites" is on the northwest corner of the building fronting W. Main Street with a secondary entrance on N. Ash Avenue. Internally, a hallway provides access to all but one of the suites (1AA). Three of the Suites (1AA, 2 and 3AA) have direct access (front door) onto N. Ash Avenue. To avoid confusion, provide a better opportunity for clients to find business tenants in these three suites, and have more success in maintaining businesses that would have an address associated to the street fronting their business, it was recommended that the following address changes be made:

<u>Present Address</u>	<u>New Address</u>
226 W. Main Street, Suite 3AA	102 N. Ash Avenue, Suite 3AA
226 W. Main Street, Suite 2	106 N. Ash Avenue, Suite 2
226 W. Main Street, Suite 1AA	108 N. Ash Avenue, Suite 1AA

Motion was made and seconded that the above address change be approved. Motion was unanimously approved. Warren will contact the Post Office to let them know that these addresses have been changed by the City. The City address map will also be updated to reflect these changes.

ITEMS BY PLANNING COMMISSIONERS

- a. Gary Janzen - None
- b. Jaque Davis – Noted that W. Main Street has some signs (including a portable sign) that may be illegal. Warren indicated that he would look at the signs and contact the owners.
- c. Danny Park - None
- d. John Dailey – None
- e. Ricky Shellenbarger - None
- f. Kathryn Schroeder - None
- g. Dee Wretberg – None

Motion was made and seconded to adjourn. Vote was unanimous. Adjourned at 8:29 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Warren Utecht
Planning Commission Recording Secretary

Approved by the Valley Center Planning Commission on October 25, 2011.

Gary Janzen, Chairman

