

MINUTES

REGULAR MEETING OF THE LANCASTER PLANNING COMMISSION

July 16, 2012

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Vose called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

INVOCATION

Vice Chairman Hall delivered the invocation.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Commissioner Terracciano led the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag of the United States of America.

ROLL CALL

Present: Commissioners Cook, Harvey, Smith, Terracciano, Vice Chairman Hall, and Chairman Vose.

Absent: Commissioner Malhi.

Also present were the Deputy City Attorney (Joe Adams), Planning Director (Brian Ludicke), City Engineer (Michelle Cantrell), Associate Planner (Chuen Ng), Recording Secretary (Joy Reyes), and an audience of 11 people.

PRESENTATION

Patricia Reyes-Cappelli and Nancy Burke from Kaiser Foundation Hospital were present to provide a slide presentation for the proposed medical campus located on Avenue L and 5th Street West. Patricia Reyes-Cappelli provided an overview of the Master Plan process for the 44-acre Kaiser Campus, as part of the Amargosa Creek Specific Plan. The Phase 1 of the master plan is to construct a 130,000 square-foot medical office building, with future phases to include a hospital, central plant, and another medical office building. She stated Kaiser's goals, and added that energy conservation was taken into account in the design, as well as creating a place for the community and members to enjoy the outdoors. There are concerns with the wind, which prompted several studies and solutions. Kaiser decided to work with the wind coming in from

the southwest corner of the project site, and a change to master plan was necessary in order to accommodate the new concept.

Instead of a typical Kaiser campus, the branding of the site will give emphasis to the Antelope Valley character. The whole campus plan is rotated at 45 degrees to allow the wind to move through the campus. Drought-resistant landscaping and berms are used throughout the campus to slow down the wind. A schematic drawing showed how campus will be designed to keep circulations separate. The site will be improved with two signalized intersections, stop signs, and landscaped medians.

One of their goals is improving the community and the environment. Kaiser has a renewed mission to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, enhance their position as an environmental leader in the healthcare sector, and manage energy-related cost (which ultimately safeguards membership dollars), as well as comply with relevant environmental laws. Kaiser is driven to achieve a net zero facility, which means that on annual basis, their facility must produce as much energy as it consumes. The buildings are designed with highly improved insulated envelope (roof, exterior walls, and slabs). They are implementing LED lighting throughout the plan, which reduces heating load; taking advantage of day-lighting to reduce the amount of power used; and extending the recycled water system.

To achieve net zero, Kaiser will be using wind turbines in combination with solar thermal panels. The prime location for a wind turbine is on the far northeastern area of the site. This area holds the path of strongest wind, and is away from the future 5-story hospital, and the residential area; surrounding the site is a mixed-use development. With a single wind turbine, the system can provide all the power the first building would need on an annual basis. In the future, two additional wind turbines would be able to support the hospital.

Kaiser envisions the campus as a friendly, healing environment for staff and members, while encouraging walkability. The pedestrian promenade will be open to the community. There is a plan for a small amphitheater that will work in conjunction with their conferencing center. Slides of the site plans were presented showing the boundaries of the facility with extensive landscaping. An aerial photo and elevation drawing of the building illustrated the façade curving of the building to respond to the wind, and tilted out 10 degrees to respond to the solar path.

Patricia Reyes-Cappelli concluded the presentation by stating that the idea of promoting a healthy community, supporting the environment, and ensuring good health extends beyond their doors.

Chairman Vose thanked Patricia Reyes-Cappelli for the presentation. He inquired as to the number of Kaiser members in the Antelope Valley. Kaiser has a projected target population five years beyond the completion date of the building, which is a population of 165,000.

Commissioner Terracciano commended the project, and inquired the anticipated number of beds for the 200,000 square-foot hospital in Phase 2. Patricia Reyes-Cappelli replied that it will depend on how the projections change; as this number will continue to be a moving target, enough room is left in the master plan to allow for up to 200 beds.

Phase 1 is intended for a secondary care facility (treatment and management of patient services who have already been identified as ill); services offered include a large pharmacy, laboratory, urology, cardiology, chemotherapy, infusion, and radiology. It is not a hospital.

Commissioner Cook inquired whether the 200-bed facility would have cardiac, obstetrics gynecology (OB-Gyn), and pulmonary services. Patricia Reyes-Cappelli stated that Kaiser is content with its current contract with the Antelope Valley Hospital for their OB-Gyn services. Cardiac services are typically reserved for tertiary care facility, which is a very large hospital.

Commissioner Smith asked if the new facility would replace the current location on 15th Street West. Patricia Reyes-Cappelli stated that the plan is to expand primary care services at the existing Lancaster offices. Commissioner Smith, being a 35-year member of Kaiser, stated she is very excited about the project.

Commissioner Cook inquired if there is a projection for a helipad on the site. Patricia Reyes-Cappelli responded there is no plan at this time, as this is usually done at tertiary hospitals.

Commissioner Harvey commented on Kaiser's greenhouse gas reduction for the new facility, and asked if there was any plan for the existing facility. Patricia Reyes-Cappelli cited efforts are made to reduce reliance on the grid by using solar panels. Without disturbing the current services provided, the existing facility is undergoing renovation, upgrading mechanical and electrical systems and bringing them up to code, and implementing energy saving devices in the upgrade wherever possible.

Commissioner Harvey commented that achieving energy savings in the existing Kaiser facility is like "low hanging fruit", given the age of the existing facility. Patricia Reyes-Cappelli asserted that some of the units have packaged units on the roof in terms of size; Kaiser will bring in BMS (building management system) software to make it more efficient, as well as insulating the buildings.

Vice Chair Hall is pleased with the building curves, and questioned about the changes made to the building. Patricia Reyes-Cappelli stated in the design of the building, they had to take into consideration the environmental conditions (wind path) and the needs of the departments, in order to provide effective health care services. In the merging of the two goals, it was necessary to square-off the sides; the curve goes through the building and comes out again as a projecting wing, shielding the main entry way. Also, the trees are layered very specifically to act as a screen, and to gradually slow down the winds that still passes through the area. They will be very selective with the types of trees, which will primarily consist of evergreen trees; and berming will be used. Kaiser is working with the City to finalize the design, and plans to do another wind study to ensure all contingencies are covered.

Chairman Vose inquired what the maximum dB unit (sound level) of the generator is at the property line. Patricia Reyes-Cappelli responded that it would be very similar to a low wind blowing. The Commission acknowledged that the presentation provided is to serve as informational, and that this project is within a specific plan area. The Commission is currently reviewing the residential zoning ordinance that will have an impact on proposed wind turbines. The Chairman trusts that this project will meet the minimum standard, for the benefit of current and future residents of the neighborhood adjacent to the proposed wind turbines.

Vice Chair Hall referred to the issue of noise generated from the wind system brought up during the last study session, and indicated that turbines at off-site facilities are simply mini-generators, and do not feed into the project; the grid is still feeding the project. He added that windmills are the only source for residents of the Antelope Valley to achieve net zero. Patricia Reyes-Cappelli asserted of having no knowledge of Edison requirements in the AV, however, is aware that Kaiser is allowed to place a windmill on the project as long as the City is in agreement. If Kaiser were to have Edison build the windmill on their behalf, there is no guarantee that it will be built in a timely manner. By actually installing wind turbines on the campus themselves, they know it is achievable, it will be completed as planned prior to the opening of the facility, and they will have control over the system that will provide Kaiser its only avenue towards net zero.

At last week's field visit, Vice Chair Hall stated he learned that when the grid goes down, the customer does not have solar generating capacity to directly serve the residence. Patricia Reyes-Cappelli indicated that Kaiser does have an emergency generator system included in Phase 1.

Chairman Vose described the maximum tower height in RR zones for non-commercial wind energy systems to be 65 feet for tower height, a maximum of 80 feet in larger parcels, and an overall diameter of 24 feet for the blade. He turned to Patricia Reyes-Cappelli for the specifics of the proposed windmill. She pointed out this is a larger system comparable to the wind turbines at Lake Palmdale, with a size of approximately 150 feet to the top of the tower, and 283 feet to the tip of the blade in its most upright position. Brian Ludicke confirmed that Kaiser's proposed turbine height is 283 feet to the top inclusive of the blade; whereas, the system at Lake Palmdale measures 315 feet to the top. Chairman Vose wanted to visually compare the mass of this system in relation to a 5-story building. Patricia Reyes-Cappelli responded that a 5-story building is typically 80 feet high, consisting of 16 feet per story. She added that the height factors in the overall efficiency of the unit and the payback period is difficult to achieve unless they go with larger turbines. Smaller turbines create a problem for birds, and generate a higher noise level. Since Kaiser is planning to place a 5-story hospital in front of the unit, the wind turbines would have to be high enough so that the prevailing wind would go up and over the building and can maximize electrical generation.

Chairman Vose concluded the discussion by stating the objectives of the General Plan, as well as those of the City Council, are to establish this community as a net zero community. Chairman Vose expressed his appreciation to Patricia Reyes-Cappelli and Nancy Burke for the candor in sharing the information with the Commission.

CONSENT CALENDAR

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved by Commissioner Terracciano and seconded by Commissioner Smith to approve the Minutes from the Regular Meeting of June 18, 2012. Motion carried with the following vote (6-0-0-1):

AYES: Commissioners Cook, Harvey, Smith, Terracciano, Vice Chairman Hall, and Chairman Vose.

NOES: None.
ABSTAIN: None.
ABSENT: Commissioner Malhi.

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS

2. Residential Zones Update

Chairman Vose opened the continued public hearing at 7:39 p.m. to hear the comprehensive update of the Residential Zoning Ordinance in Title 17, Chapter 8 of the Lancaster Municipal Code.

Chairman Vose informed of the Commission convening at the Richmond American Homes (Westside) and KB Home (Eastside) residential developments on Monday, July 9, 2012. Both site visits with representatives from each development were informative.

Chuen Ng provided a slide presentation summarizing the outreach efforts made to obtain input and participation from homebuilders, various local agencies and building association, as follows:

At the June 18, 2012, Planning Commission meeting, concerns brought up by the Building Industry Association of Southern California (BIASC) included requirements for solar provision and additional elevations for subdivisions, and lack of immediate benefit to added density for subdivisions.

At the July 9, 2012, field visits, information gathered from each representative from Richmond American Homes and KB Home, both of which provide solar panels as a standard option, included:

- Standard 1.44 kWh Photo Voltaic (PV) system generates a minimal amount of energy, merely taking customers out of SCE's Tier 4 or 5 price structure.
- 50 to 70 percent of customers upgrade to larger systems.
- Cost to install PV system as part of the new house is lower compared to retrofitting existing houses.
- Incentives to customers and builders make it feasible to provide PV as a standard feature to new homes and lower the costs to upgrade.
- An aerial photo of the KB Home Arroyo site 2 was shown to illustrate PV panels on the roof; standard 1.44 kWh PV system typically consists of 6 panels, and optional larger systems are between 12 and 18 panels.

Chuen Ng concluded the presentation stating staff is available to answer any questions. There were none in the audience who wished to speak on this item.

Chairman Vose pointed out that Commission discussion at the last regular meeting ended on the premise of making solar PV a requirement for new homes. Discussion on this subject ensued.

Commissioner Cook, who was absent from the field visits, inquired as to the homebuilder's cost to include the system as a standard feature, and whether the cost can be added to the mortgage. Chuen Ng responded the builder representatives provided an estimated cost of \$5,000 per kilowatt system, inclusive of labor cost and materials (inverter each at \$1,500, and a 6-panel system roughly \$1,500). During the field visit, Tom DiPrima of KB Home commented one way the solar power system is marketed to homebuyers is to include the cost of system into the mortgage, which is around \$10,000 for the standard 1.4-kilowatt system, adding only about \$20 to their monthly mortgage. In return, the homebuyer could see a reduction of about \$80 per month on their energy bill.

Commissioner Smith asked for clarification on the benefits of having the standard 1.4-kilowatt system, whether it provides adequate energy to support the average home, or it actually eliminates the top tier(s) of the energy billing rates. Chuen Ng responded that the reduction is dependent on the power usage of the household. The standard solar PV system generates 1.4-kilowatt-hour of electricity for every hour of sunshine. To achieve lower tier rates, it is essential to do an analysis of one's energy consumption, comparing it with the average kilowatt-hour generated by the PV system; and choosing the proper kilowatt system is key to eliminating the top tier rates. Brian Ludicke added Tom DiPrima had indicated that having at a minimum a 1.2-kilowatt system is necessary in order to see the benefits of lower tier rates, and there are tax incentives for upgrading to larger systems that will significantly lower the overall cost.

Chairman Vose interjected that by establishing a standard in the zoning ordinance for solar energy requirements would create a long-term impact on the builder, and ultimately the consumer; whereas tax incentives are likely to fluctuate over time. Moreover, the KB Home Arroyo tract homes are oriented North-South, which is optimum for solar production; configurations of other approved subdivisions may not be as ideal.

Chuen Ng concurred that indeed there are trade-offs to the proposed regulation; for instance, additional roof pitches can affect the buildable area for installing solar panels. In a prior meeting with the BIASC, Antelope Valley Director Marta Brown stated the agency's preference is to have the solar PV system as optional rather than as a requirement. She cited that there was a discussion between the Public Works Director and Administration on an incentive program for builders.

Chairman Vose stated that as the regulating body, the Commission should take into consideration marketability, livability, as well as aesthetics for the review and update of this ordinance. He conveyed the need for further review and clarification of the ordinance in general, and in particular the section on solar energy.

Brian Ludicke responded that staff will propose some language for the update of the ordinance based on the discussion by the Commission, comments from the builders during the field visits, and internal discussions on alternative approaches to implementing solar energy requirements, such as phasing in the requirement, allowing builders to comply over a period of time.

Vice Chair Hall commented that his neighbor, who had also participated in the field visits, suggested leaving the renewable energy requirement open-ended, and not just limiting it to solar. While there is no existing requirement, there are already two builders offering solar power system as standard feature. Federal tax incentives are market-driven; the only other incentive for buyers to invest on this type of renewable energy is when they see a significant reduction on their power bill. Vice Chair Hall voiced that he would like to see an open-ended renewable energy requirement, which would allow for alternative energy, such as windmill or central plants.

Additionally, Vice Chair Hall asked for the definition of net zero, as he had thought that by simply installing solar panels would allow one to be self-sufficient. Brian Ludicke stated that Kaiser Foundation Hospital's architect clarified the term by stating that a building with net zero energy generates as much energy as it consumes on an annual basis. Vice Chair Hall added that Tom DiPrima of KB Home commented that to be fully self-sufficient, homeowners would need the ability to store solar electricity, such as by way of battery banks. He looked into the Chevy Volt hybrid electric vehicle with a 110-volt charge cord; the smart cord limits the SCE cost to \$1.40 per day to charge the Chevy Volt, according to the salesperson. The vehicle can be fully charged in 11 hours. This brought up the point of net zero's criteria of self-sufficiency, which the installation of solar panels on the roof does not meet.

Chairman Vose pointed out that excess electricity production from solar PV system goes back into the local utility grid. During power outages, however, the system shuts down and there is no power back up for the homeowner. Vice Chair Hall noted it is important the public is made aware that installation of solar PV systems does not constitute net zero; in other words, it does not provide self-sufficiency in terms of power. Brian Ludicke expanded that these "behind-the-meter devices" essentially is still connected to the power grid, and the energy generated serves only to offset consumption.

Commissioner Smith agrees with Vice Chair Hall in finding different ways for alternative energy solution; however, cost, efficiency, and aesthetics must also be taken into consideration for minimum standards.

Commissioner Vose noted during the field visit, the builder homes with installed solar panels had ideal clean roof lines. It would be essential that this aesthetic requirement is regulated to ensure all homebuilders comply with the standard.

Chuen Ng stated that since the release of the draft ordinance, staff has received numerous comments including the solar topic, which will be taken into consideration for the final draft, addressing all the concerns raised by the Commission.

Commissioner Harvey alluded to the thought-provoking discussions on alternative energy, and agreed with Chairman Vose that further review is necessary.

There being no further discussion on solar/alternative energy, Chairman Vose proceeded to other topics and issues the Commission wish to raise.

Vice Chair Hall read through his list of concerns he provided to staff, as follows:

- Cargo containers ordinance – language added to ensure containers are maintained. Chairman Vose also suggested adding an aesthetic requirement to paint the containers complimenting the surrounding area.
- 17.08.200 – concerning storage of large amounts of explosive powder.
- Garage conversions – covered off-street parking requirement to ensure sidewalk is not blocked. Chuen Ng clarified that, as with any structure, there is a 20-foot front yard setback requirement that prohibits construction of any structure within that setback. Current requirement, which allows garage conversion provided there are two covered or uncovered parking spaces onsite, remains the same in the proposed ordinance.
- Guesthouses in the front yard – Chuen Ng noted that it would be allowed if there is sufficient area in the front yard to meet setback and architectural requirements. Vice Chair Hall inquired whether the guesthouse can be rented out. Chuen Ng explained the distinction between a guesthouse and a second dwelling unit: a guesthouse has a maximum of 500 square feet intended as a detached bedroom to house guests; a second dwelling unit serves as a second house on the property, as long as it meets setback requirements, and the owner resides onsite. Vice Chair Hall inquired whether the developers are allowed to build guesthouses and/or second dwelling units. Chuen Ng responded the developers are allowed to maximize the potential of any lot, provided they are in accordance with the zoning code. Vice Chair Hall would simply like that the language in the ordinance be clear as to what is allowed.

Chairman Vose further commented on the subject of second dwelling units, stating that as changes occur in the City's demographics, so do the consumer's needs and perceptions; thus, this may motivate multi-generational housing opportunity for the developers. Brian Ludicke added that motive of change is a major driver. Accommodating aging parents has been a major concern, and second dwelling units allow them their own space. Although second dwelling units have been allowed in the code for years, and is an easy approval process, there have not been many constructed. Chairman Vose pointed out that utility services for guesthouses are connected to the main house; however, water and sewer services must be separate utilities for second dwelling units; and no water approval letters are currently being issued. Chuen Ng stated there have been concerns received regarding the expense for this type of use, and the proposed ordinance is drafted to mitigate those concerns. In the last ten years, there have only been about six requests for additions of second dwelling units. Chairman Vose cited that although it is a great concept, it might not be economically viable for the typical resident to comply with all the requirements. Chuen Ng added that as a result, most build these units illegally and with code violations.

Commissioner Terracciano commented on the utility connection for a second dwelling unit, and proper metering for specific zonings; meeting all permit and building requirements for the additional utilities would be a financial burden. Brian Ludicke affirmed Chairman Vose's statement that second dwelling units are proposed to be allowed in R-7,000 lots or larger, provided they meet the property development regulations. Brian Ludicke speculated whether second dwelling units would then be subject to solar provisions.

Chairman Vose stated it would be economically viable if these units were incorporated into the initial development of subdivisions, to which Brian Ludicke affirmed.

On page 17, Chairman Vose asked for the definition of “Safe by design”. Chuen Ng described it to be techniques used to minimize opportunities for criminal behaviors, such as by way of added lighting and building orientation to maximize safe path of travel. This concept is covered in the Design Guidelines.

On page 17 related to architectural roof forms, Chairman Vose implied gable overhang requirement of no less than 12 inches offers no aesthetic benefit, and suggested that an 18-inch overhang should be the minimum standard. He inquired whether this was required as a result of the adopted Design Guidelines. Chuen Ng affirmed and commented that there can be trade-offs when using quantitative number to describe as qualitative as aesthetics, which should be taken into consideration when weighing benefits of having such a requirement. Chairman Vose expanded on the original use of gables.

On page 18 – No. 3, Chairman Vose referred to the large expanses of paving (such as asphalt, concrete, and decomposed granite). Chuen Ng informed this is in the context of multi-family development, to break up large parking areas in apartment complexes with additional landscaped planters.

On page 18 - building design, Chairman Vose commented on the two different roof lines relative to installation of alternative energy, and the schematic for the porch area requirements for each small single family home. Chuen Ng noted accurate references will be added to page 20. Chairman Vose suggested replacing the word “porch” with “alternative architectural feature”. Chuen Ng responded that staff will consider revision to the language once all comments are received.

On page 19, Chairman Vose opened the discussion on density bonus incentives. Establishing regulations and standards are necessary; economic conditions change; political realities of government change. Working standards are reasonable and fair. Planning Commission’s objective is to establish a fair standard; City Council may choose to waive a standard or offer incentives.

Vice Chair Hall described density bonus incentives as presented in the staff report, and asked to verify that these only benefit design tracts, and not the existing recorded maps. Chuen Ng provided a distinction between density bonus and infill incentives. The City’s draft mirrors that of the state’s existing density bonus ordinance, which contains very specific requirements, wherein if a builder provides deed restricted affordable units, the builder could achieve a density beyond what the zone allows. The infill incentive, on the other hand, is a new program that is being implemented as a result of the adopted general plan policy, providing incentives for building on vacant lots within the urban core.

Chairman Vose referenced to pages 22 and 23, letter b (Section 17.08.080), on projects requiring entitlements and environmental clearance for Planning Commission consideration. Chuen Ng noted that any density bonus requests would be reviewed concurrently with the project; if the project requires an environmental review, then the project, in conjunction with the density bonus request, would be under the Commission’s purview. Brian Ludicke clarified that this section establishes who the responsible parties are during the course of the normal approval

process for density bonus requests. In the last 10 years, Brian Ludicke recalls that the two previously approved density bonus projects to be “seniors only” projects.

On page 31, in reference to parking requirement uses for single family homes as two parking spaces in an enclosed garage, Chairman Vose asked for clarification whether the required two parking spaces for a condo with a garage unit is enclosed. Chuen Ng affirmed that the intent is for them to be enclosed.

On same page 31 on parking requirements for school, 33 spaces per 100 students, Chairman Vose stated these numbers are unrealistically high for typical elementary schools or college campuses. Furthermore, all public schools are exempt from parking requirements. Chuen Ng stated that these numbers are obtained from the ITE (Institute of Transportation Engineers) manual that publishes parking generation rates. Chairman Vose cited if it would be reasonable to impose such requirements to private sectors, whereas public sectors are exempt. Brian Ludicke inquired whether there is a State requirement for parking ratio for public schools; Chairman Vose affirmed the assessment is up to the local district.

Chairman Vose referred to the next section on paying-in-lieu parking fees for future public parking, and asked if there is an existing in-lieu parking fee ordinance to support the proposed regulation. Brian Ludicke stated there is none at this time, and adoption of this regulation would allow for creation and ultimately adoption of such ordinance.

On page 37, number 7, Chairman Vose asked for clarification on “parking spaces will be clearly outlined with 4-inch lines painted,” and ... how to measure double line parking. Chuen Ng replied the double line parking is measured from the center of each double-striped area, and the single-striped is measured from the center of each 4-inch white stripe. Chairman Vose suggested for consistency in the phrasing.

On page 38, Chairman Vose asserted that *number 6*, “all landscaped planters for interior parking areas shall be completely bordered by a 6-inch concrete curb to prevent runoff and act as a wheel stop where necessary;” and *number 7* “Vehicle overhang into landscaped areas is prohibited,” appear to be contradictory, in conjunction with the curb defined in the previous section to be 6-inch high and 6-inch wide.

On page 39, number 11, the Chairman suggested “at least 25 percent of all trees installed shall be from a 24-inch *box*,” may be modified to “trunk” in order to use caliper (diameter) width as the standard.

On page 39, letter A.1, on sign regulation for street address numbers being lighted/illuminated during hours of darkness, Chairman Vose commented he does not recall them to be illuminated in new subdivision housing. Brian Ludicke stated that he has seen the numbers lit in newer subdivisions. Commissioner Harvey asked staff to expound “new” (in terms of the year the houses were built). Brian Ludicke implied that homes built in 2005 to 2006 generally have this feature, but staff will look into this further.

On page 40, B.1, relating to temporary signs posted for more than 90 days shall require a temporary sign permit. Chairman Vose pointed out that he has observed temporary residential realty sale signs, including those owned by the Lancaster Housing Authority, remain posted longer than 90 days, due to the economic realities of the residential realty market. He questioned whether the Housing Authority obtained sign permits in conformance with this regulation, as he

was certain that no one in the real estate industry have permits. Chairman Vose further noted the temporary signs with permits are valid only up to one year, as indicated under B.6 (Duration). Chuen Ng cited that staff has not seen that many applications for temporary signs; nonetheless, staff has not made any efforts to go after illegal signs. Chairman Vose interjected stating that temporary signs do tend to deteriorate over time creating aesthetic nuisance; thus, it often becomes a code enforcement issue, Chuen Ng added.

Vice Chair Hall inquired whether the sign ordinance is specific to residential zone or overarching for all zones. Chuen Ng responded that it is specific to residential zones; it may reference signage for multi family structures (apartments, condos, etc.). Vice Chair Hall suggested creating a sign ordinance that can be referenced in different sections of the Code. Chuen Ng indicated that some municipalities have their regulations organized in this manner, in which there is one chapter on signs applicable to residential, commercial, offices, etc. Whereas, in the City's zoning ordinance, each of the zones (e.g., residential, commercial) has its own sign regulations; however, often there is redundancy throughout sections. Chuen Ng stated that it is a matter of preference on the part of the municipality, whichever it finds to be most effective.

Vice Chair Hall commented that perhaps having all sign regulations under one ordinance would be ideal; and this is something to be considered seeing that the review of the sign ordinance is an impending task for the Commission. Chuen Ng clarified that should the Commission choose to have one overarching ordinance, a placeholder under the residential zone can be inserted; removal of this section would otherwise result in a lack of residential sign regulations to enforce. Chairman Vose considered it user-friendly for developers to have all sign regulations in one section. Chuen Ng responded that there are different viewpoints on this based on usability of the ordinance (by zone or by type of development); hence, it can be organized accordingly.

On page 42, C.1.c., subdivision sale signs, allows permitted signs measured from the bottom of the sign; Chairman Vose questioned if this regulation is read as such that the allowed height is measured vertically above that. Chuen Ng responded the intent is for the measurement to be no taller than 12 feet.

With regards to fencing, Chairman Vose pointed out the type of fencing is not specified in this section; therefore, any structure can be construed as fence. Chuen Ng clarified there is a section for prohibited fence materials.

On page 47, Chairman Vose commented on the projections permitted into the yard, and referenced back to the discussion of allowable structures in the front yard. Chuen Ng responded that this section on structural projections is intended for architectural features, such as eaves and fireplace; whereas, setbacks are designed for usable and livable space. Chairman Vose voiced his concern about alternate structures in front of a dwelling, rather than on the side or rear.

Chairman Vose inquired about the Cargo Containers. Chuen Ng responded that this section reflects the ordinance that was adopted by the City Council.

Chairman Vose commented on animal keeping (page 51), whether the dog ordinance from the Los Angeles County Code correlates with the City's ordinance, for the benefit of its residents in rural residential zones. Chuen Ng will research into this section further, including the lot area description.

Chairman Vose pointed out that the designations have changed. Chuen Ng affirmed there was reorganization of some of the sections.

Chairman Vose commented on the section for Guest Houses, to ensure there is a clear distinction between housing for guests and second dwelling units, as well as the limitations in terms of size and number of structures allowed.

On page 60, number 13, Chairman Vose indicated the “covenant of restriction” for the second dwelling units should be established as a standard in the ordinance. Deputy City Attorney Joe Adams stated this type of form of covenant can be drafted to include in the ordinance.

One page 61 and 62, Chairman Vose commented on the prohibited razor wire and barb wire fencing for solar farms; whereas, the Commission recently approved one with this type of fencing. Chuen Ng replied that at the time this section was drafted, the environmental planner provided the typical fencing requirement for solar farms, and this was used as a placeholder.

On page 67 for non-commercial wind energy systems (NC-WES), Chairman Vose commented as to the accuracy of the tower height and blade size, and questioned whether the equipment could potentially generate a noise level beyond the 65 decibels. Brian Ludicke stated the ordinance contains the typical residential noise standard for this type of system, which is 65 decibels. The noise level from NC-WES does not exceed the standard; complaints have primarily been for the rhythmic sound the system emits.

Chairman Vose mentioned some terms used interchangeably throughout the ordinance, such as applicant, developer, and builder.

Brian Ludicke declared staff’s intent is to review all comments received thus far, and determine which changes to incorporate into the code. An explanation with staff recommendation for each comment will be presented to the Commission in the form of a matrix.

Brian Ludicke responded to the Chairman’s question and advised that the public hearing be continued to the August meeting, to allow staff time to compile comments and prepare staff recommendations, as well as include additional information for distribution to the Commission no less than three days prior to the agenda review special meeting in August. He does not expect the Commission to take action on this item until after the August meeting.

Chairman Vose announced the public hearing would remain open, and continue to the August 20, 2012, Planning Commission Meeting.

NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS

3. Tentative Parcel Map No. 72015

Chairman Vose opened the public hearing at 8:14 p.m. to hear a request by the City of Lancaster to subdivide five (5) industrial lots in the Specific Plan (SP) No. 90-01 Zone, 21± gross acres located east of the Union Pacific Rail Road tracks on the north side of Avenue L.

Chuen Ng presented the staff report.

Chairman Vose restated added Condition No. 4 to “restrict direct vehicular access to Avenue L and to Morton Way.” Furthermore, he inquired as to the intention of added Condition Nos. 5 and 6 for the requirement of a hydrology study. City Engineer Michelle Cantrell indicated that both are actually part of Standard Condition No. 10-24, amended to require submittal of the hydrology study *prior to recordation* of final map, instead of *prior to submittal* under the standard condition.

There were none in the audience who wished to speak in opposition to the report. Public hearing closed at 8:17 p.m.

It was moved by Commissioner Harvey and seconded by Commissioner Cook to adopt Resolution No. 12-21 approving Tentative Parcel Map No. 72015. Motion carried with the following vote (6-0-0-1):

AYES: Commissioners Cook, Harvey, Smith, Terracciano, Vice Chairman Hall, and Chairman Vose.
 NOES: None.
 ABSTAIN: None.
 ABSENT: Commissioner Malhi.

DIRECTOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

None.

COMMISSION AGENDA

None.

PUBLIC BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR - NON-AGENDA ITEMS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Vose declared the meeting adjourned at 8:18 p.m., to the Special Meeting for Agenda Review on Monday, August 13, 2012, at 5:30 p.m., in the Planning Conference Room, City Hall.

THOMAS (RANDY) HALL, Vice Chairman
 Lancaster Planning Commission

ATTEST:

BRIAN S. LUDICKE, Planning Director
 City of Lancaster