

The Planning Commission of the City of Fort Bragg met in regular session on the above date at 6:00 p.m., in the Fort Bragg Town Hall, 363 N. Main Street, Fort Bragg, and the following items were discussed in the order presented.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Mark Hannon, Vice Chair Burley Cox, Commissioners Becky Ellis, David Linkhart, and Georgia Lucas.
Absent: Commissioner.
Staff Present: Marie Jones, Community Development Director; Chris Carterette, Planner; and Nancy Philips, Administrative Secretary.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Moved by Ellis, seconded by Cox, to approve the January 24, 2007 Regular and Special meeting minutes as written.

**VOTE: Ayes: Commissioners Cox, Ellis, Lucas, and Chair Hannon.
Abstain: Commissioner Linkhart, who was not present at either meeting.**

PUBLIC COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

None.

CONDUCT OF BUSINESS

1. Introduction of New Planning Commissioner

Community Director Jones welcomed David Linkhart to the Planning Commission and noted that he has been in the area since 1984.

2. Election of Officers

The meeting was turned over to Philips, who called for nominations for Chair. **Lucas nominated Hannon as Chair, which was seconded by Ellis.** There were no other nominations for Chair.

VOTE: Ayes: Commissioners Cox, Ellis, Linkhart, Lucas, and Chair Hannon.

Hannon called for nominations for Vice Chair. **Lucas nominated Cox, which was seconded by Linkhart.** There were no other nominations for Vice Chair.

VOTE: Ayes: Commissioners Cox, Ellis, Linkhart, Lucas, and Chair Hannon.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

3. DR 3-07; February 20, 2007; Cameron Yarbrough (applicant/owner); 344 North Main Street (APN 008-152-05); Design Review to renovate façade of former "For the Shell of It" building. Proposed exterior renovation would include 13 additional windows, increased façade height and trim features, new siding, and redwood columns.

The Agenda Item Summary Report prepared for this item was reviewed with the Commission by Carterette.

1. Linkhart noted that the site map reflected the wrong address and inquired whether it affected noticing requirements. He asked why the application could not be processed administratively; whether the current awning would be removed, and if it is appropriate for the Commission to consider the use of the building. Linkhart stated that it is a great project and an improvement, but inquired as to the purpose of the two 12" redwood columns. If the columns were for structural

purposes, he could see them, but that they do not improve the design and seem exorbitant when considering green building practices being discussed at a workshop later that evening.

2. Lucas asked if there would be a second story as the façade height would be increased by three feet. She added that she did not see a reason to require a third color to their scheme. Lucas noted that it was unfortunate that the applicant was not present and inquired whether staff could ask them why they want to put in 12" columns.
3. Hannon stated that did not understand why extra redwood would be a problem. The extra height appears to be for the additional windows.
4. Carterette replied that the correct address is on the public hearing notice and as such meets noticing standards. This application was brought to Commission, rather than being handled administratively, due to requirements spelled out in the Land Use & Development Code and because the property is in the Central Business District. The renderings of the proposed renovation do not include awnings. Carterette noted that the applicant was not present to answer the question about the columns but that structural issues came about in planning the renovation. He said that he does not know whether the columns were part of that solution or were intended for decorative purposes. The applicant had told him that he considered adding a second floor, but it proved to be cost prohibitive. The additional fenestration would bring light into the building.
5. Jones stated that the City has not had a policy about green building practices but may soon formulate one based on recommendations by the Commission and Council. Proposed land use comes into play if there is a change in use, but at this point we do not know what business will be there, so that item is not discussed in the staff report.

Chair Hannon opened the public hearing at 6:24 p.m.; seeing no one wishing to speak, he closed the public hearing at 6:25 p.m.

Discussion:

5. Jones offered that the Commission could make a motion to have staff ask the applicant about the reason for the columns and continue the hearing to their next meeting. The application could also be approved as is.
6. Ellis stated that green building standards are a current topic and material choices are a part of it, but this project should move forward.
4. Carterette said that staff could advise applicants to consider green materials when designing projects.

Moved by Cox, seconded by Lucas, to approve DR 3-07 based on the following findings and subject to the conditions cited below:

FINDINGS

1. The project complies with the purpose and requirements of Section 18.71.050 (Design Review).
2. The project provides architectural design, building massing, and scale appropriate to and compatible with the site surroundings and the community.
3. The project provides attractive and desirable site layout and design, including building arrangement, exterior appearance and setbacks, drainage, fences and walls, grading, landscaping, lighting, signs, etc.
4. The project provides efficient and safe public access, circulation, and parking.
5. The project is consistent with the General Plan.
6. The project complies and is consistent with the City's Design Guidelines.
7. The proposed project is consistent with the purpose and intent of the Central Business District (CBD) zoning district, as well as all other provisions of Title 18 of the Fort Bragg Municipal Code.
8. The project will not have any significant adverse impacts on the environment within the meaning of the California Environmental Quality Act.

9. For the purposes of the environmental determination, the requested modifications are considered existing facilities and are exempt from further environmental review under the California Environmental Quality Act.

STANDARD CONDITIONS

1. This action shall become final on the 11th working day following the decision unless an appeal to the City Council is filed pursuant to Land Use & Development Code (LUDC) Chapter 18.92.
2. The use and occupancy of the premises shall be established and maintained in conformance with the requirements of this permit and all applicable provisions of the Land Use & Development Code.
3. The application, along with supplemental exhibits and related material, shall be considered elements of this permit, and compliance therewith is mandatory, unless an amendment has been approved by the City.
4. This permit shall be subject to the securing of all necessary permits for the proposed development from City, County, State and Federal agencies having jurisdiction. All plans submitted with required permit applications shall be consistent with this approval.
5. The applicant shall secure all required building permits for the proposed project as required by the Building Department.
6. This permit shall be subject to revocation or modification upon a finding of any one or more of the following:
 - (a) That such permit was obtained or extended by fraud.
 - (b) That one or more of the conditions upon which such permit was granted have been violated.
 - (c) That the use for which the permit was granted is so conducted as to be detrimental to the public health, welfare or safety or as to be a nuisance.
 - (d) A final judgment of a court of competent jurisdiction has declared one or more conditions to be void or ineffective, or has enjoined or otherwise prohibited the enforcement or operation of one or more conditions.
7. This permit is issued without a legal determination having been made upon the number, size or shape of parcels encompassed within the permit described boundaries. Should, at any time, a legal determination be made that the number, size or shape of parcels within the permit described boundaries are different than that which is legally required by this permit, this permit shall become null and void.
8. This Design Review approval in compliance with Section 18.71 of the LUDC shall lapse and become void twelve months from the date of approval unless before the expiration of twelve months, a building permit is issued and construction has commenced and diligently pursued towards completion or an extension is requested and obtained in accordance with LUDC 18.71.050 (H)(3).

VOTE: Ayes: Commissioners Cox, Ellis, Lucas, and Chair Hannon.
Noes: Commissioner Linkhart

4. **LLA 1-07 & CDP 2-07; February 22, 2007; Richard Berta, Century 21 (applicant); Robert, Donna, & Anthony Rossi, Alex Sarti, and Richard & Marissa Nelepovitz (owners); Clifford Zimmerman (agent); 441 South Street; (APN 018-340-05/07) Lot line adjustment and Coastal Development Permit to adjust 0.21 acres from APN 018-340-07 to APN 018-340-05**

Planner Carterette informed the Commission that staff recommends that this application be continued to April 25, so that staff has time to research property conditions that recently came to light.

Chair Hannon opened the public hearing at 6:37 p.m.

Moved by Lucas, seconded by Cox, to continue LLA 1-07 & CDP 2-07 to April 25, 2007.

VOTE: Ayes: Commissioners Cox, Ellis, Linkhart, Lucas, and Chair Hannon.

CONDUCT OF BUSINESS (CONTINUED)

5. Matters from Chair/Commission/Staff

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Hannon adjourned the meeting at 6:38 p.m.

Mark Hannon, Chair

ATTEST:

**Nancy Philips
Administrative Secretary**

INDEXED: _____ (____)

IMAGED: _____ (____)