



# COUNTY OF SANTA BARBARA

## JOINT PLANNING COMMISSION AND CENTRAL BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW MARKED AGENDA

Hearing of November 8, 2006  
9:00 a.m.

### COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

C. MICHAEL COONEY	1st District, Vice Chair	County of Santa Barbara Betteravia Government Center 511 East Lakeside Parkway Santa Maria, CA 93455 (805) 568-2000 (Planning & Development)
CECILIA BROWN	2nd District	
DAVID SMYSER	3rd District	
JOE H. VALENCIA	4th District, Chair	
JACK BOYSEN	5th District	

### CENTRAL BOARD OF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW

\* **The Central Board of Architectural Review participated only on Item CR-1, "Mountainview Homes" Manufactured Home Subdivision.**

Bethany Clough, <b>Chair</b>	Erich Brown, <b>Alternate</b>
C. Puck Erickson-Lohnas	Lowell Lash, <b>Alternate</b>
Kris Miller Fisher, <b>Vice-Chair</b>	Evans Jones
Robin Brady	

**TV COVERAGE ANNOUNCEMENT:** *Planning Commission Hearings are televised live on County Santa Barbara Television (CSBTV) Channel 20 at 9:00 A.M. in the South Coast, Lompoc, Santa Ynez Valley, Santa Maria and Orcutt areas. Rebroadcast of the Planning Commission Hearings are on Fridays at 5:00 P.M. on CSBTV Channel 20.*

### ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA:

- I. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
- II. **TV COVERAGE ANNOUNCEMENT:** by Cintia Mendoza.
- III. **ROLL CALL:** All Commissioners were present.
- IV. **AGENDA STATUS REPORT:** Presented by Cintia Mendoza.
- V. **PROJECTION REPORT:** Presented by Cintia Mendoza.
- VI. **PUBLIC COMMENT:** None.
- VII. **PLANNING COMMISSIONER'S INFORMATIONAL REPORTS:** Commissioner Valencia thanked all the candidates who participated in yesterday's election and congratulated all those who won.

Commissioner Smyser announced that his daughter and son-in-law who have been serving in Iraq over the past year were rotated out of Iraq and are now in Germany and Kuwait.

Commissioner Boysen requested that staff look into the allowing of Residential Second Units in design residential zone districts with a minor conditional use permit. Commissioner Boysen stated that he would like a better feel on size, bulk and scale and requested that staff provide background information. Definition is not needed, just more education.

Commissioner Brown agreed with Commissioner Boysen and stated that size, bulk and scale need to tie in with neighborhood compatibility.

VIII. **PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT DIVISIONAL BRIEFINGS:** Steve Rodriguez briefed the Commission on the Providence Landing project.

IX. **MINUTES:** The Minutes of October 25, 2006 were considered as follows:

**ACTION: Approved the Minutes of October 25, 2005.**

**Cooney/Smyser Vote: 4-0-1 (Brown abstained)**

X. **DIRECTOR'S REPORT AND BOARD OF SUPERVISORS HEARING SUMMARY:**  
Presented by John Baker, Director, Planning and Development via remote testimony.

XI. **CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS AND PROCEDURE:**

	<b>BreitBurn Energy Orcutt Hill Diatomite Project</b>	<b>Orcutt</b>
<b>C-1. 05PPP-00000-00001</b>		
06NGD-00000-00018		Steve Rodriguez, Planner (805) 934-6250

Hearing on the request of John Deacon, agent for the owner, BreitBurn Energy, to consider Case No. 05PPP 00000-00001 [application filed July 1, 2005] for approval of an Oil Drilling and Production Plan (Phase II) allowing the construction and operation of up to 96 oil wells that would use steam injection to enhance oil recovery, under the provisions of Article III Zoned AG-II-100; and to approve the Negative Declaration, 6NGD-00000-00018 pursuant to the State Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act. As a result of this project, significant but mitigable effects on the environment are anticipated in the following categories: Aesthetics, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Fire Protection, Geologic Processes, Hazardous Materials, Transportation/Circulation, and Water Resources. The ND and all documents may be reviewed at the Planning and Development Department, 624 W. Foster Rd., Santa Maria. The ND is also available for review at the Central Branch of the City of Santa Barbara Library, 40 E. Anapamu St., Santa Barbara. The application involves AP Nos. 101-020-041 and -074, located in the Orcutt area, Fourth Supervisorial District.

**ACTION: Approved the project.**

**Valencia/Boysen**

**Vote: 5-0  
10 day appeal process; fee required.**

XII. **CONCEPTUAL REVIEW:**

	<b>“Mountainview Homes” Manufactured Home Subdivision</b>	<b>Santa Ynez</b>
<b>CR-1. 06PRE-00000-00014</b>		
		John Karamitsos, Supervising Planner (805) 934-6255 Brian Tetley, Planner (805) 934-6589

Request of Mr. Steve Orosz of SRI Two, LLC, agent for the Gould Family Trust, landowner, for Planning Commission and Central County Board of Architectural Review (CBAR) Conceptual Review of the LLC “Mountainview Homes” Manufactured Home Subdivision Pre-Application project, Case No. 06PRE-00000-00014. This conceptual project proposes subdividing a 5.72-acre parcel into 60 lots and developing the site with 60 pre-manufactured on and two-story homes on non-permanent foundations. Implementation of the proposed project would require future approval of a Tentative Tract Map and Final Development Plan. The project involves AP No: 141-211-062, located at 2950 Mission Drive (Hwy 246), in the Santa Ynez area, Third Supervisorial District.

**ACTION:** Accepted late submittals into the record from Joseph Chiaravallotti and Bob and Anne Hourdequin.  
Smyer/Boysen **Vote: 5-0**

**ACTION:** Conceptual review only, therefore no final action was taken. The Commission and CBAR made the following comments on the project:

**CBAR Chair Bethany Clough:**

- As Mr. Orosz indicated, the project had returned to us this past Friday. They had changed the site plan in response to a couple of our comments. However, we had extensive comments in regard to that review.
- There were five or six residents that attended the site visit and subsequent hearing.
- The very first comment that we had was that the applicant needs to meet with the residents so that the residents know what the process is and what their options are.
- Mr. Orosz indicated that accommodations were to be available to the existing residents to relocate to the south edge the park.
- We need to clarify a comment from the first CBAR conceptual review. The comment was that parking was inadequate. What we were actually discussing was much more complicated. The quantity of the parking is not the issue, it is the location. The inadequacy was referring to the length of the on-street parking space.
- Between two drives there would be two parallel parked vehicles and we didn't feel that that was sufficient.
- The site plan is still very rectilinear and rigid.
- There's still too much pavement and building coverage.
- The open space, with the exception of the very small park, is minimal.
- I understand that there is a 15% minimum open space requirement. With such a low percentage, we would like to see that all of it is usable by the residents in a fashion that can function for them. The proposed park is a good first step.
- Overall, the site plan and layout is designed around motor vehicles to the extent that there are no internal pedestrian pathways with the exception of the one adjacent to the clubhouse.
- All pedestrians would be forced to walk down the middle of the street with parking on both sides.
- More internal and connected common open space is needed to create a green "backbone" for the site plan. These areas would provide an off-street walking option so that residents are not forced to walk on the streets.
- The applicant did relocate the clubhouse to a centralized location. This is a strong improvement.
- CBAR prefers a narrower road. The overwhelming preference is to reduce the width of the road and perhaps allow parking only on one side.

- There was a lot of discussion about safety of the circulation plan, especially the cul-de-sac in the middle. This should be converted to a through access.
- Separate landscaped or otherwise screened parking lots should be provided for residents, guests, and an RV storage area. There is no provision here for recreational vehicles or boats that residents may have.
- The proposed project feels claustrophobic. Particularly the area between the units, especially the two-story units. They're very close together. We have some very real concerns about how it would feel to be in one of those units, two-story to two-story and the very narrow space in-between.
- A reduced density would allow for more internal variation of building footprints and more of a gentle undulation of streets instead of this rectilinear grid form. It would help to improve mobility of use from the internal streets towards the dead-ends which are very harsh and tie in with that claustrophobic feeling.
- We had a lot of discussion about smaller and/or more single-story units.
- There are some concerns about the drainage concept. It's unclear how the drainage basin would work with the site topography. There are other low points on the site that could be utilized by smaller infiltration/detention areas and bioswales that could be multi-functional.
- It appears that the project does not meet ADA requirements. It is not clear what changes would be required.
- Large-scale landscaping within the Highway 246 CalTrans Right-of Way would help reduce visual impacts.
- We have concerns about residents using garages for storage. CC&Rs should allow only parking in garages.
- Include locations on the site plan for solid waste pickup and collection. As of right now, there is no place to put it. I'm not sure that you can shoehorn it in.
- There were some other things having to do with public comment.

**CBAR Member Puck Erikson**

- Even though this would be zoned for 12.3 units per acre, it doesn't necessarily mean in every instance that you can develop up the maximum density. Every property comes with certain constraints that are folded into what is a reasonable level of development for each parcel. I wanted to make sure that everybody understood that, and that I understood.
- In terms of this kind of density, one of the key issues is that this is a vehicular-driven site plan.
- I laud the applicants' effort to provide affordability, all things being relative in the valley, but honestly something's got to give.
- When you consider tandem parking and 192 parking spaces, you've eliminated all of the pedestrian access.

- What are these really going to look like when they are completed? You have side yard setbacks of five feet.
- In this kind of dense project, the devil is in the details. It's a very complicated project to look at. I hope that as the project moves along, the PC will be thinking about what the final project will look like.
- It's an urban project with a lot of urban constraints

**CBAR Member Evans Jones:**

- We saw some slides on the architecture of what these units might look like, and I know they are just conceptual.
- During the CBAR review, we didn't look at the architectural in any detail. We were more concerned about the site planning and the concerns that were brought up here.
- The slides showed units that appear to be very tall, but we will look at the architecture in greater detail when they come in for the actual submittal.
- I wanted to point out that we have not reviewed the architecture in any detail up to this point.

**CBAR Member Kris Miller:**

- We made a few suggestions about the density and the open space because the open space is not usable.
- Creating the open space down the center of the site would allow for a continuous walkway by taking out, say, one unit per strip.
- Or you could change the density from a 1,200 ft<sup>2</sup> unit to something smaller, say a 600 ft<sup>2</sup> unit that would be a starter unit or a retired or single-person's unit. So you could keep the same number of units but have more compact sites. So, there's a lot of variety and a lot of opportunity in this.
- Also, we wanted to see more green between units, perhaps eight or nine feet rather than the proposed five-feet between units.

**Chair Valencia:**

- I think the project is a little too dense, just extremely dense.
- When I saw it, I thought, my God, how are they going to get in there.
- People have to have a little space, you need to be able to go out and stretch your arms.
- You'll be able to open your window there and get a cup of coffee from your neighbor. That's just a bit much.

**Commissioner Boysen:**

- My biggest concern is that we're doing this while the Santa Ynez community plan is in process. The whole purpose of the Santa Ynez community plan, if we're going to have one, is to address land uses on properties such as this, and this is a very important site, as I see it.
- I'm a huge proponent of this type of manufactured housing project. I think it can be done right. I think the applicant has proposed doing it right.
- As far as the density is concerned, this is one of those good news/bad news situations. The less density, you're going to make it more expensive and attractive. Some of that density is going to come with the territory.
- I can always remember that my wife and I moved into a house next door to a mobile home park. The realtor tried to convince us to buy a house in another location and was telling us all of the problems living next to a mobile home park. They were the best neighbors I've ever had in my life. They were quiet and never had a party. I'd much rather live next to a mobile home park than a lot of individual residences that I've lived next to, believe me. It was a sheer delight.
- As far as traffic, and I got to know this mobile home park intimately, there was never any traffic.
- With the type of residents that are attracted to a mobile home park, you don't have an extended family with a bunch of cars and the whole thing.
- I'm not as concerned, I guess, as CBAR is with the density issues.
- I realize it's a family park, but if you look at the family parks here in the Santa Maria area that have been here for years and years, it will be rare to actually find families living in these parks. A lot of times you'll have, perhaps, a person like myself in their fifties with teenage or college-age children that are making their transition out of the home, you may occasionally have one of these, but normally it's a couple and it's not families in a park like this.
- I'm very concerned about the condition of the park right now. I'm very concerned about the state of disrepair, if Mrs. Harlequin's pictures are correct.
- I hope, and I would direct Mr. Tetley to ensure that Building and Safety is aware of this situation, and Building and Safety, Environmental Health Services, and the Fire Department may want to take a look at that and see if we have anything there.
- I'm very concerned with that. I'm very concerned about the residents there. I want to make sure that they are taken care of, whether it's some kind of compromise of allowing them to stay on the southern portion, I could probably buy in to something like that.
- There are certain rights here. This is not like an apartment building where people are renting on a month-to-month basis, etc. They've made an investment, they've purchased a home, and they're renting their ground space, effectively. They have more rights than just to say you need to leave because we have another project coming on. At least that's my feeling.
- I don't want to see them displaced, and I want to make sure that we take care of the families that are there. I can imagine my own parents living in a park like this and the turmoil they would be going through right now if they were in the same situation that the Harlequin's are. I want to make sure that that is first and foremost in any project that comes forward, that these people are taken care of.

- Those would be my comments. I like this project. I think that this is a proper use of the land in this spot, but I want to make sure that some of these issues are taken care of.

**Commissioner Brown:**

- One thing I agree with Commissioner Boysen is the concern for the current residents and how they've been treated.
- Just looking at the site, I have a hard time believing that the County would allow these conditions to exist. Maybe they did send somebody out there to do an inspection once a year, maybe they didn't, I don't know. I think someone needs to go out to ensure that everything is as it should be.
- Concerning the proposal, I understand about mobile home parks and why we have them. In the area I live in there are several, some in the incorporated area and some in the unincorporated area.
- They are supposed to be affordable housing, and people use them as such. I don't believe that the project as proposed is affordable. I think that that people will buy these units and there will be an additional cost for the ground space. And that will make it unaffordable with the units proposed.
- I agree with CBAR that smaller units would be better. You would get a little more landscape rather than hardscape.
- For me, the site plan is not workable: people would be walking in the street, it will be an alley of cars.
- The mobile home parks in the area where I live have cars everywhere on the site, on the streets, and on Calle Real. In fact, a young man was killed recently.
- The area is horrible. There are many low-income families living in the area with multiple cars. There's not enough space on the site to accommodate all of the vehicles. As such, all of the cars park on the public streets. It is not very well kept-up. The County certainly doesn't keep it up. I have similar concerns here about where all of the cars are going to park. It will not be a park for people, but a park for vehicles, and that concerns me.
- Garages in more affordable projects become storage areas. Any storage areas then places the burden on the homeowner's association to enforce the CC&Rs to make sure that cars are parked there, and it doesn't work. Carports with storage areas would be a much better solution.
- Where is the trash area? This and some of these other issues need to be addressed. I'm sorry that that hasn't been worked out because I think that that always needs to be a part of the project.
- Landscaping is critical for this project. I don't have a good feel for it, I know you answered one of my questions about it, but I need to have greater assurances about landscaping for the entire park and for the individual mobile homes.
- I understand that making it less dense will make it more expensive, but there's got to be a trade-off between what is proposed and what CBAR is imagining, and I'd like to see you go in that direction.

**Commissioner Cooney:**

- I absolutely agree with my fellow Commissioners that we have a responsibility to not only plan what is on the site in the future, but when it is brought to our attention, what's going on in the present.
- If I were one of the owners, I would put as a priority cleaning up the existing site.
- I know most of the Commissioners, if not all, visited the site last week. We were conscientious about that. There were people living there, but it looked like they were the remaining tenants of a Brooklyn tenement before it is pulled over. I really think that a work in progress needs to be a much quicker progress to make it livable in the meantime.
- As far as what will be placed here in the future, I really agree with the comments of CBAR with regard to the orientation.
- If you backed up and looked at this blank piece of property as a living space and not a parking space, you would have a much better project from the word go. It's not that the units are so close together, although the second-story elements impact that significantly in my view, it's a small enough living area that residents should be able to move around the entire space on foot, and should be encouraged to do so.
- Consequently, you have to design parking areas that are separate from the units. If there are garages, it would be nice if every unit had a garage and could park what vehicles they need to park on-site inside a garage. But realistically, people of all segments of our society bring vehicles with them and you're going to have to plan for a portion of the site, or someplace off-site, to park these vehicles. It's not realistic to expect people to park on the driveway. They'll park everywhere they can otherwise. It has to be accompanied by CC&Rs.
- That single orientation of the site away from vehicles in the living areas will make a big improvement in the design.
- I certainly agree with Commissioner Boysen that manufactured housing is a solution for many people in our community. We have to find a way for people to live in sanitary, clean, and enjoyable conditions, and you have the start of that project.
- But as long as you give in to that demand for on-site and adjacent parking, it will ruin the context of your project, in my view.

**Commissioner Smyser:**

- Having gone through the VPAC meetings regarding land use planning in the Santa Ynez valley, the first piece that I got from Mr. Peterson, who was involved in the VPAC, is that the VPAC's intentions was to rezone this site for a mobile home park, and to have the zoning consistent with the current uses.
- As you look at the site as it appeared a couple of years ago, I think we could agree that the homes are pretty close together, not a whole lot of setbacks and the pedestrian movement is not that good, as it existed.
- When the applicant first expressed interest in purchasing the property and moving forward with plans there were meetings with the Third District Supervisor, one in Santa Barbara and one in the Solvang office.

- Initially, the newspapers were full of stories about concerned neighbors in the park, and at the time they were represented by an attorney. After those meetings, it is important to recognize that 37 decided to accept the applicant's offer to buy out their properties.
- Mr Chair, I must point out that I have not heard from any of those 37 to indicate that they were forced out. In fact, I know a couple of people, friends of mine, that were living in the park at the time and felt that the applicant's offers were generous considering the dilapidated condition of some of the units, some of which were not occupied.
- I'm not trying to defend the applicant, but I just want to indicate that there's always two sides to each story.
- Here's what I'm taking away from the public comments that I've heard today: one is the concern that the site be clean, which they have every right to expect. As we've heard, the County has been alerted to a situation that needs to be cleaned up.
- I also understand that a meeting has been scheduled between the remaining residents and the applicants to discuss what provisions will be made to accommodate the existing residents on-site. These questions need to be resolved quickly.
- The Commission is concerned about the health and safety of the existing residents.
- I've heard concerns that the revised design is still too dense. I've also heard some concern about two-story units and that they tend to render the site claustrophobic. I've heard that it is not a pedestrian friendly plan. And that more design considerations can be taken into account to provide better open space, at least the 15% open space is at least actual, functional open space. Also, a concern about setbacks between properties and greater architectural variation.
- The one concern that everyone in the valley will have is viewshed from Highway 246. Second-story units on the 246 side is likely not going to be acceptable because it will block mountain views for everyone that drives by the project.
- I've also heard that more variation in the size of the units would allow for a better site plan and the opportunity to serve those looking for a smaller unit rather than a larger unit.
- I would suggest that it would be more visually appealing if you had an open space corridor in the middle of the park and you had greater setback between the lines.
- I'm going to suggest that the current design is about eight units too many. The reason is that if you remove the line that was on 246, with the exception of perhaps a few corner lots, you could expand the distance between properties, you could open up the central corridor, and allow for a more diverse plan.
- I also think that you're going to need some sidewalks in here, and some pathways through the open space so people can access without walking through the traffic lanes. That's why I think the central corridor concept is so attractive because everyone then will have access to all of the facilities.
- Currently there were 44 units. You're proposing 16 more. I'm splitting the baby and suggesting eight additional units. I'm not saying that that is set in concrete, because with some smaller units, you may be able to get a few additional units.
- I think that that would provide a nice buffer from 246 and the neighbors to the south.

- I want to thank the applicant because these are not easy projects to design. I haven't received any angry letters from those residents that left. So, something must have gone right, or we would have received letters.
  - I also want to applaud you for taking the pressure off 246. Anyone that lives in the valley knows that 246 across from the high school is a mess. Purchasing an easement through the Christian Academy was a marvelous idea that cost the applicant a good bit of money. It has provided an option for people to utilize Refugio during peak traffic times.
  - The place where the park used to enter 246 is dangerous and I can sympathize with the member of the public that had an accident. There have been a number of accidents there.
  - There would now be a secondary emergency access for fire control, and a central greenbelt would also be helpful in that regard.
  - Those are my thoughts. I'm supportive of the project because the VPAC was supportive of the project and saw this project as a valuable asset that needed to be protected in the plan.
  - What I'm hearing is that there is a desire to have collective parking areas throughout the project site. I think that this could be handled by a minor reduction of the number of units and/or a reduction in the size of the units.
  - The other issue is parking of RVs and other vehicles. There are a few areas in the valley to store these vehicles. It would be nice if you could accommodate some area for parking these vehicles.
  - I would personally be opposed to restriction of storing boxes in a garage. There should be some accommodation for temporary storage, especially immediately after moving in.
- ? I leave it up to the CBAR to determine if garages or carports are more appropriate.

**XIII. STANDARD AGENDA:**

**1. 06APL-00000-00019 Ballantyne Appeal Goleta**

June Pujo, Supervising Planner (805) 568-2056  
Allen Bell, Planner (805) 568-2033

Hearing on the request of Peter N. Brown, attorney for the owner/applicant/appellant, Lynn Ballantyne to consider the Appeal 06APL-00000-00019 [appeal filed on June 23, 2006], of the Planning and Development Department's decision to deny Land Use Permit Case No. 05LUP-00000-00611, for a single family residence, guesthouse, barn and accessory structures on a 17 acre parcel in the AG-II-100 Zone District under Article III. The application involves AP No. 079-090-036, located at 500 Farren Road, Goleta area, Third Supervisorial District. (Continued from 7/26/06 and 10/4/06)

**ACTION: Accepted a late submittal into the record from Joan S. Bolton.**  
**Smyser/Boysen** **Vote: 5-0**

**ACTION: Approved the Appeal, upholding the Land Use Permit, with revisions to the findings and conditions of approval.**  
**Smyser/Boysen** **Vote: 3-2 (Cooney/Brown no)**  
**10 day appeal period; fee required.**

**Daniels Tentative Parcel  
Map/Lot Split**

2. **03TPM-00000-00008** **Santa Maria**  
**06NGD-00000-00020** Adam Baughman, Planner (805) 934-6265

Hearing on the request of David and Jennifer Daniels, owners, to consider Case No. 03TPM-00000-00008, for approval of a Vesting Tentative Parcel Map under the County Code Chapter 21 to divide 23.42 acres into two developable parcels consisting of 10.00 acres and 13.42 acres; and to approve the Negative Declaration, 06NGD-00000-00020 pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act. As a result of this project, significant but mitigable effects on the environment are anticipated in the following categories: Aesthetics, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Fire, Geologic Processes, Noise, and Water Resources/Flooding. The ND and all documents may be reviewed at the Planning and Development Department, 624 W. Foster Rd., Santa Maria. The ND is also available for review at the Central Branch of the City of Santa Barbara Library, 40 E. Anapamu St., Santa Barbara. The application involves AP No. 129-151-038, located east of HWY 101 and south of Clark Avenue, at 2222 Richview Road, in the Orcutt area, Fourth Supervisorial District.

**ACTION: Approved the project with revisions to the conditions of approval.**

**Valencia/Boysen**

**Vote: 5-0**

**10 day appeal period; fee required.**

3. **06APL-00000-00035** **Halsell Single Family**  
**06APL-00000-00036** **Dwelling Appeal** **Santa Maria**  
Joyce Gerber, Planner (805) 934-6265

Hearing on the request of Terry Morgan, agent for the Westrails Home Owner's Association, and Shirley Brady, to consider the appeals 06APL-00000-00035 and 06APL-00000-00036 [applications filed on September 11, 2006] of the Planning and Development's decision to approve Land Use Permit 06LUP-00000-00585 for a home addition in the 1-E-1 Zone District under Article III. The application involves AP No. 105-010-079, located at 1372 Solomon Road, in the Orcutt Area, Fourth Supervisorial District.

**ACTION: Continued the item to the hearing of December 13, 2006 in Santa Maria.**

**Valencia/Cooney**

**Vote: 4-0 (Smyser absent)**

**Appeal process not applicable.**

4. **Final San Jose Creek  
Watershed Plan**

Second District Office

Hearing on the request of Second District Supervisor Susan Rose to receive a report on the Final San Jose Creek Watershed Plan and forward to the Board of Supervisors with a recommendation to receive and file. This plan was developed by stakeholders in the watershed including agencies, landowners, residents and community-based organizations to improve and protect the natural processes and resources of the San Jose Creek watershed that includes identifying opportunities to enhance the natural functioning of the creek ecosystem and respecting private property and community values.

**ACTION: Recommended that the Board of Supervisors receive and file the San Jose Creek Watershed Plan.**

**Brown/Cooney**

**Vote: 4-0 (Smyser absent)**

**The Planning Commission Agenda, Marked Agenda and Staff Reports are available on the  
Planning and Development Web Site at  
[www.sbcountyplanning.org](http://www.sbcountyplanning.org)**

---

Dianne Meester Black  
Secretary to the Planning Commission

G:\GROUP\PC\_STAFF\WP\PC\AGENDAS\PC AGD 2006\11-08-06mkd.doc