



# City of Santa Barbara Planning Division

## PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

July 7, 2005

### **CALL TO ORDER:**

The meeting was called to order at 1:11 p.m.

### **ROLL CALL:**

#### **Present:**

Chair Jonathan Maguire

Commissioners: Charmaine Jacobs, Stella Larson, Bill Mahan, George C. Myers and Harwood A. White, Jr.

#### **Absent:**

Vice-Chair John Jostes

### **STAFF PRESENT:**

Bettie Weiss, City Planner

Allison De Busk, Associate Planner

Kathleen Kennedy, Assistant Planner

Barbara Shelton, Environmental Analyst

Victoria Greene, Project Planner

Trish Allen, Associate Planner

Jill Zachary, Creeks Restoration/Clean Water Manager

Chris Hansen, Building Inspector/Plan Check Supervisor

Barbara Shelton, Environmental Analyst

Rob Dayton, Supervising Transportation Planner

N. Scott Vincent, Assistant City Attorney

Barbara Walsh, Acting Planning Commission Secretary

## **II. PRELIMINARY MATTERS:**

A. Requests for continuances, withdrawals, postponements, or addition of ex-agenda items.

None.

B. Announcements and appeals.

None.

C. Comments from members of the public pertaining to items not on this agenda.

None.

**III. CONSENT ITEMS**

**ACTUAL TIME: 1:12 P.M**

**A. APPLICATION OF BILL POEHLER, AGENT FOR HARRY WRIGHT, 2530 MESA SCHOOL LANE, APN 041-292-039, E-3/S-D-3 ONE-FAMILY RESIDENCE AND COASTAL OVERLAY ZONES, GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: RESIDENTIAL – 5 UNITS PER ACRE, (MST2004-00618, CDP2005-00005)**

The project applicant seeks approval to subdivide a 20,000 square foot parcel into two parcels. Parcel 1 would be 12,050 gross square feet and would contain the existing single-family residence and a remodeled attached two-car garage. Parcel 2 would be 7,950 gross square feet and would be developed with a single-family residence converted from the existing utility building and a new two-car carport.

The discretionary applications under consideration are:

1. Modification to allow a newly created parcel to have less than the required 60 feet of frontage on a public street (SBMC § 28.15.080);
2. Tentative Subdivision Map (TSM) to divide one parcel into two residential parcels (SBMC Title 27); and
3. Coastal Development Permit to subdivide and make improvements to a residential parcel located in the non-appealable jurisdiction of the Coastal Zone (SBMC § 28.45.009).

The Environmental Analyst has determined that the project is exempt from further environmental review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Guidelines Sections 15315, 15303 and 15301.

Ms. De Busk gave an overview of the project.

The public hearing was opened at 1:15 p.m.

The following person spoke in opposition to the project:

Robert Cummings

With no one else wishing to speak, the public hearing was closed at 1:18 p.m.

Bill Poehler, Agent, spoke regarding easements.

Ms.Hubbell stated the interior yard setback in this zone is six feet.

Commissioners' comments and questions:

1. Expressed concern regarding the modification requested and thought the six-foot set-back onto the interior lot is inadequate.
2. Thought the project is incompatible with the neighborhood.
3. Thought the proposal does not fit into an E-3 zone.
4. Questioned conformance and pointed out that the subject lot is twice the size as the smaller lots.
5. Was in favor of the project; however, suggested a more successful application regarding the vertical building envelopes.
6. Suggested further study by the Architectural Board of Review.
7. Recommended a designated pathway from the door to the street.
8. Suggested the applicant return with a proposal that has more definition.
9. Stated the street is too narrow and crowded.
10. Could possibly support a project that included restrictions on building size and building envelope.

**MOTION: Mahan/Myers**

**Assigned Resolution No. 046-05**

Deny the project. The Commission cannot provide findings for the requested modification or the Coastal Development Permit, which requires neighborhood compatibility.

This motion was carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 5 Noes: 1 (Maguire) Abstain: 0 Absent: 1 (Jostes)

Comments to the motion:

Bill Poehler, Agent for the Applicant, requested the Commission reconsider the proposed sub-division and take into account the large lot size and easements currently in place.

Commissioners' comments and questions:

1. Requested a proposal that is more defined in size, bulk, and scale.
2. Thought Mesa School Lane has charm and character due to the wide variety of house sizes and does not support sub-dividing.
3. Desired to preserve the common synergy of openness and communal tranquility in the neighborhood.
4. Felt a denial is not appropriate and thought the project could be redesigned with building envelopes.
5. Suggested that the item be continued instead.

Chair Maguire stated the decision is appealable to the City Council within ten days.

**ACTUAL TIME: 1:40 P.M.**

**B. APPLICATION OF PETER EHLEN, AGENT FOR PROPERTY OWNERS, RICHARD A. AND NANCY J. GRAHAM, TRUSTEES, 301 SOUTH HOPE AVENUE, APN 051-240-019, E-3/PD/SD-2/SP-4: ONE-FAMILY RESIDENCE, PLANNED DEVELOPMENT, UPPER STATE STREET AREA SPECIAL DISTRICT, AND RANCHO ARROYO SPECIFIC PLAN ZONES, GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: RESIDENTIAL, FIVE UNITS PER ACRE/ PLANNED CENTER/ BUFFER-STREAM (MST2003-00135)**

The project consists of an addition of 466 square feet of second floor office space, conversion of a 408 square foot storage area into a training room, addition of six new covered, unenclosed service bays equaling 3,630 square feet, relocation of one wash bay, and the addition of 190 square feet of open storage space at the Graham Chevrolet-Cadillac Auto Center.

The discretionary application required for this project is a Development Plan to allow development in the Planned Development zone (SBMC§28.39.130).

The Environmental Analyst has determined that the project is exempt from further environmental review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines Section 15301 (alterations and additions to existing facilities).

**MOTION: Mahan/Larson**

To waive the presentation of the staff report.

This motion was carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 6 Noes: 0 Abstain: 0 Absent: 1 (Jostes)

With no one wishing to speak, the public hearing was opened and closed at 1:41 p.m.

Commissioners' comments and questions:

1. Requested clarification from Staff regarding the trail easement along Arroyo Burro Creek.
2. Stated that the strip along the creek could be wider and landscaped.
3. Stated that the applicant could install a gate and remove weeds but that any restoration should be in conjunction with a larger creek restoration project.
4. Asked about whether Measure E applied to this project.

Ms. Kennedy stated that Measure E Development Plan approval by the Planning Commission is not required because the proposed project involves less than 1,000 square feet.

Ms. Hubbell remarked that the trail easement was part of the requirement of the Rancho Arroyo Specific Plan and stretches along the entire Arroyo Burro Creek from Calle Real to Hope Avenue. She stated that there are no plans in place currently to connect the trail easement on this site to the existing trail.

**MOTION: White/Mahan**

**Assigned Resolution No. 047-05**

Approve the development plan as proposed with the findings SBMC 28.39.130 as outlined in the Staff Report.

This motion was carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 6 Noes: 0 Abstain: 0 Absent: 1 (Jostes)

Chair Maguire announced the ten calendar day appeal period.

**ACTUAL TIME: 1:48 P.M.**

**(CONTINUED FROM JUNE 2, 2005)**

**C. APPLICATION OF JAN HOCHHAUSER, HOCHHAUSER BLATTER ARCHITECTS, AGENT FOR PROPERTY OWNERS, JOE W. BUTLER II AND PAMELA J. QUIRKE, TRUSTEES, 508 E. DE LA GUERRA STREET, APN 031-101-018 AND 514 E. DE LA GUERRA STREET, APN 031-101-019, R-3: LIMITED MULTIPLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE ZONE, GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: RESIDENTIAL, TWELVE UNITS/ACRE (MST2004-00233)**

This item was continued from the June 2, 2005 Planning Commission hearing. The project consists of a lot line adjustment between 508 E. De la Guerra Street (APN 031-101-018) and 514 E. De la Guerra Street (APN 031-101-019) and a proposal for four new condominium units in two (2) two-story buildings on the 508 E. De la Guerra Street parcel. Building A would consist of one (1) three-bedroom unit with an attached one-bedroom rental unit. Building B would consist of one (1) one-bedroom unit, one (1) two-bedroom unit and one (1) three-bedroom unit. Three single-family residences would be demolished on the 508 E. De la Guerra Street parcel. Plans for development of 514 E. De la Guerra Street are included for informational purposes only and are not part of the application.

The discretionary applications required for this project are:

1. Modification to allow 508 E. De la Guerra Street to have less than the required lot area in the R-3 Zone (SBMC§28.21.080);
2. Modification to allow 514 E. De la Guerra Street to have less than the required lot area in the R-3 Zone (SBMC§28.21.080);
3. Modification to allow 514 E. De la Guerra Street to have less than the required sixty feet (60') of frontage on a public street in the R-3 Zone (SBMC§28.21.080);
4. Lot Line Adjustment to change the property line between 508 E. De la Guerra Street (APN 031-101-018) and 514 E. De la Guerra Street (APN 031-101-019)(Gov. Code §66412); and
5. Tentative Subdivision Map (TSM) for a one-lot subdivision for four residential condominium units, and one rental unit as part of one of the condominiums, on the 508 E. De la Guerra Street parcel (SBMC§27.07).

The Environmental Analyst has determined that the project is exempt from further environmental review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines Section 15301 (demolition of individual small structures), Section 15305 (minor lot line adjustments) and Section 15303 (new construction of small structures).

**MOTION: Mahan/Myers**

To waive the presentation of the staff report.

This motion was carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 6 Noes: 0 Abstain: 0 Absent: 1 (Jostes)

With no one wishing to speak, the public hearing opened and closed at 1:49 p.m.

Jan Hochhauser gave a brief summary of the project.

Ms. Kennedy presented an overview of the project.

Commissioners' comments and questions:

1. Reminded the Commission there was previous discussion regarding the increase in the use of permeable pavement proposed in the area of the Oak tree and of the new standard condition regarding connecting each front door to the street on the sidewalk.
2. Questioned neighbor reaction to story poles and thought story poles a favorable announcement for proposed projects.
3. Suggested story poles used for all new proposals.
4. Appreciated the porch and thought the bus stop improvements were positive.

Ms. Kennedy stated there was one visit from the Housing Authority to review the plans and there was no negative response.

**MOTION: Mahan/White**

**Assigned Resolution No. 048-05**

Make the findings for the modifications, lot line adjustment, tentative subdivision map and residential condominium development and approve the project subject to the conditions of approval including the following new conditions: incorporate the new drawing of the middle building on E. De la Guerra St., increase the amount of previous surface near the oak tree, and add the new standard condition regarding pedestrian access from the front doors of the units to the sidewalk.

This motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 6 Noes: 0 Abstain: 0 Absent: 1 (Jostes)

Chair Maguire announced the ten calendar day appeal period.

**IV. DISCUSSION ITEM:**

**ACTUAL TIME 1:55 P.M.**

**DRAFT STORM WATER MANAGEMENT PROGRAM**

Receive Planning Commission and public comment on the revised Draft City of Santa Barbara Storm Water Management Program (SWMP), prepared pursuant to the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Phase II requirements.

Ms. Zachary presented an overview of the proposed Storm Water Management Program.

Mr. Hansen discussed the Minimum Control Measure No. 4. (erosion and sedimentation control/construction site storm water runoff control).

Ms. Shelton spoke regarding post-construction, long-term water quality management.

The public hearing opened at 2:32 p.m., and the following person spoke in favor of the project:

Whitney Forester, Heal the Ocean

With no one else wishing to speak, the public hearing was closed at 2:34 p.m.

Commissioners' comments and questions:

1. Felt pleased with the filtration in the parking lots and is eager to support the clean-up effluent to the ocean.
2. Thought the program is excellent and commended Staff for the development of the document and the ongoing process of the program.
3. Suggested incorporating "Green Building" construction management techniques into the document.
4. Stated that a "strong" Ordinance is needed. "Stop work" requirements are more effective than fines, but fines are also a good tool to promote compliance.
5. Suggested that the Plan include education as well as enforcement.
6. that, in the past, a lot of heavy metals were used in construction and asked if that is leading to soil contamination and if more soils testing should be required.
7. Asked about monitoring run-off from private driveways and streets and what is the remedial action. Asked if there is a way to report violations.
8. Understands there are questions from the public about what is being done with Measure B funds and how come there are no results. Creek clean-up takes time and this Plan is part of that process.
9. Questioned the absence of private sewer laterals in the Plan.
10. Thought that construction sites need to be more closely monitored. Appreciate a team approach, instead of just being an enforcer.

11. Suggested Staff look into a program that monitors run-off while a storm is hitting and thought that a dike system would be beneficial on construction sites .
12. Asked how many grading projects are in progress during November within the last three years.
13. Questioned if the City intercepts street storm water and if it is filtered.
14. Asked whether certain roofing materials are less polluting than others.
15. Stated there is a need for better information regarding capacity and extent of storm drains including on private property.
16. Thought there is not enough information on the storm drains and suggested more sewage system information be documented in regards to capacity and extent, which would include private property compliance and pumping situations.
17. Suggested developing and implementing a sewer maintenance program.
18. Asked if roofs pollute.

Ms. Hubbell stated that the City building inspectors monitor the sites prior to any storms to assure that erosion control measures are in place.

Ms. Zachary answered that “washing” is currently lawful and that the City of Santa Barbara Ordinances allow the washing of sidewalks and power washing as long as it does not discharge polluted water into the storm drains. Additionally, she stated there are filters and screens in place throughout the City and these are currently being monitored, that bacteria levels are currently high, and concluded that street sweeping has not been proven to be beneficial before storms. She also stated that roofs probably do pollute, but the City has not sampled downspouts.

Mr. Hansen stated there is no regular sampling done for asbestos or heavy metals at construction sites and that an Ordinance is in place to control contaminants. In response to a question regarding grading, Mr. Hansen answered approximately sixty percent of projects have some form of erosion sedimentation control and there is a formalized procedure and policy.

Ms. Shelton stated while there is not routine sampling, if there is any question of site contamination, evaluation is done as part of environmental review as on a case-by-case basis and that there are regulations in place.

**V. NEW ITEMS:**

**ACTUAL TIME: 3:23 P.M.**

**A. APPLICATION OF L&P CONSULTANTS, AGENT FOR GARY AND ELIESA BOLLINGER, 687 GROVE LANE, APN 057-263-018, E-3 ZONE DISTRICT, GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: RESIDENTIAL, 5 UNITS PER ACRE (MST2002-00691)**

The proposed project consists of a three-lot subdivision of a 38,891 square foot lot at 687 Grove Lane. The proposed parcels would be 22,316 square feet (Parcel A), 9,065 square feet (Parcel B) and 7,510 square feet (Parcel C). An existing residence, detached garage, pool and spa would remain on Parcel A. Parcels B and C are currently undeveloped and no development is proposed at this time. All three parcels would be accessed from the existing driveway.

The discretionary applications required for this project are:

1. Modification of the street frontage requirement for two of the newly created lots (SBMC §28.15.080);
2. Waiver from the requirement that each lot created by a new subdivision shall front upon a public street or private driveway serving no more than two lots (SBMC §22.60.300); and
3. Tentative Subdivision Map to allow the creation of three lots (SBMC §27.07.100).

The Environmental Analyst has determined that the project is exempt from further environmental review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Guidelines Section 15315, Minor Land Divisions.

Ms. Greene gave an overview of the project.

Brent Daniels, L&P Consultants, gave an overview regarding the parent parcel, utility pole connections, driveway alignment, and future house size and review.

The public hearing was opened at 3:37 p.m., and the following people expressed their concerns:

Helen Dolan  
Janet Miller

The following people spoke in opposition to the project:

Rick Sawyer  
Kathy Sawyer  
Jim Kahan

With no one else wishing to speak the public hearing was closed at 4:00 p.m.

Commissioners' comments and questions:

1. Three lots are not in keeping with the neighborhood.
2. Thought the floor-to-area ratio is too high on Lot C.
3. Thought a three-lot subdivision is possible with changes to building size and lot configuration.
4. Appreciates the compromises and changes to the proposal.
5. Thought the project does not "feel right" or "look right" with the comment that there is a significant amount of area but it is not configured correctly.
6. Thought the project is too dense.
7. Could support a continuance pending a site-visit.
8. Complimented the neighbors and the applicant for their views and presentations.
9. Stated it is not possible to protect private views.
10. Thought the "tight site" is a "red flag" for intense development and expressed that the site area is a natural, "easy flowing" area and quiet neighborhood.

11. Felt the neighborhood would change significantly with the proposal.
12. Appreciates the opportunity for a closer look at the site and commended the neighbors for their graciousness.
13. Suggested prohibiting future subdivision on Lot A.
14. Commented that lots B and C could be brought closer together in size.
15. Thought the pavement on the driveway is acceptable, but the idea is to differentiate where people walk.
16. Reminded the Agent that the Commission had requested a clear delineation of the proposed sidewalk.
17. Requested chalk lines on the ground and story poles in order for the Commission to clearly understand the proposal at the site visit.
18. Thought the presentation was hard to read and requested the next presentation be bolder, express the plans more clearly, and evaluate the proposal in relationship to the neighbors.

**MOTION: Mahan/Larson**

Continued one week with the following comments: 1) The Commission is to conduct a site visit. 2) More clearly indicate, on the drawings, the distinction between the lots and the development envelope. 3) A 16-foot high story pole would be appreciated.

This motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 6 Noes: 0 Abstain: 0 Absent: 1 (Jostes)

Recessed at 4:31 p.m., and reconvened at 4:40 p.m.

**ACTUAL TIME: 4:40 P.M.**

**B. APPLICATION OF PEIKERT GROUP ARCHITECTS, LLP, AGENT FOR PEOPLES' SELF-HELP CORPORATION (APPLICANT) AND THE CITY OF SANTA BARBARA REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY (PROPERTY OWNER), 21 E. ANAPAMU STREET, APN 039-183-037, C-2, COMMERCIAL, ZONE, GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: GENERAL COMMERCE/PUBLIC/INSTITUTIONAL (MST2004-00173)**

The project consists of construction of a three-story structure to include 12 one-bedroom rental units on the 4,184 square foot parcel owned by the City Redevelopment Agency. The overall building area is proposed to be 8,456 square feet with units ranging in size from 497 to 623 square feet. The rental units would be targeted to very low- and low-income households (8 units at 60% of the Area Median Income (AMI) and 4 units at 50% of the AMI).

The discretionary applications required for this project are:

1. A Modification of the lot area requirements to allow ten over-density units (bonus density) on a lot in the C-2 Zone (SBMC §28.21.080);
2. A Modification to allow the parcel to have less than the required 60 feet of frontage on a

public street (SBMC § 28.21.080.A);

3. Modifications to allow the structure to encroach into the required 10-foot interior yard setbacks (SBMC § 28.21.060.2 and 28.21.060.3);

4. Modifications to provide less than the required 10-foot minimum dimension for private outdoor living space for Units 2, 3, and 4 (SBMC § 28.21.081);

5. Modifications to provide less than the required private outdoor living area for Units 4, 6, and 7 (SBMC § 28.21.081); and,

6. A Modification to provide fewer than the required number of parking spaces (SBMC § 28.90).

The Environmental Analyst has determined that the addendum to the Final Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared for the Granada Garage project, conditioned to provide for an affordable housing project, adequately addresses the proposal and the change in the building site from the north side of the garage to the south side. The level of impact associated with the project has not substantially changed.

Ms. Allen gave an overview of the project.

Jeanette Duncan, Director of People's Self Help Housing Corporation, stated her support of the project and proposed development of the space.

Detlev Peikert, Architect, gave a summary of the.

With no one wishing to speak, the public hearing was opened and closed at 5:00 p.m.

Commissioners' comments and questions:

1. Asked what happened to prior proposals for this space and why more commercial space was not considered.
2. Requested how the footprint of the lot was established and why green space was not considered for the project.
3. Asked about the possibility of making the project bigger by bringing the project out into the green space, which would eliminate possible perceived problems regarding the green space.
4. Questioned the additional one foot walkway space between the placita and the access to the building and asked for clarification of the property line for the adjacent property owner.
5. Asked what is currently proposed for the open space.
6. Requested clarification regarding the required handicap access at the stairway entryway.
7. Commented about the possibility of favoritism and policy consistency in regard to meeting accessibility requirements.
8. Recognized that the City of Santa Barbara and the Affordable Housing Programs were praised in the recent Grand Jury Report and Santa Barbara Housing was recommended to the County of Santa Barbara to be used as a model.
9. Recommended increasing sidewalk width by one foot from the placita to the front of the building and suggested keeping the eight foot condition of approval.

10. Stated concern with the location of the compressors adjacent to 1201 Anacapa building and cautioned the applicant regarding air being circulated into the street.
11. Suggested moving the 1201 Anacapa building trash enclosures and air handlers.
12. Thought the project and design are beautiful and the use is beneficial.
13. Credited the Historic Landmarks Commission for direction to relocate the parking structure to the North.
14. Can support all the requested modifications.
15. Stated that a residential project in a commercial area problematic.
16. Appreciates the green space.
17. Suggested that the Redevelopment Agency add active space in the open space area adjacent to the project site that would add "rhythm" to the street, rather than a passive area.
18. Suggested a ten foot width passageway for the Paseo.
19. Study architectural enhancements to visually open up the narrow sidewalk-area.

Ms. Hubbell explained the Redevelopment Agency shifted its goals for the site, which has allowed for a more livable space.

Steven Faulstich, Housing Program Supervisor stated the project had changed from the original plans and that the City Council's intent was to assure the affordable housing be maximized in the area along the parking structure and the open space also be maximized for the purpose of a park or for open space. Mr. Faulstich also explained there is not development currently planned for the open space; however, City Council has expressed its desire for the future to eventually plan a redevelopment agency project which would improve the area. Initially, the Council plan does not include above-grade buildings at this time, except a minor building to provide an entrance.

Mr. Peikert explained the plans for the handicap ramp.

Ms. Allen stated various designs have been considered regarding accessibility and Staff has been working closely with Building and Safety in looking at alternatives and that signage will be erected for accessibility direction.

**MOTION: Mahan/Jacobs**

**Assigned Resolution No. 049-05**

Make the modification findings as outlined in Staff Report along with the environmental findings and approve the project, subject to the conditions of approval, and the following amendments: 1) Suggest the applicant work diligently with the adjacent property owner of the building located at 1201 Anacapa St. to relocate the compressors so that, if feasible, the walkway can be wider than seven feet. 2) Staff shall review with Building and Safety the appropriate handicapped access. 3) Staff shall research the highest and best use of the park/open. 4) Construction shall not begin prior to Christmas 2005.

This motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 5 Noes: 1 (White) Abstain: 0 Absent: 1 (Jostes)

Mr. White voted against the project because it is an inappropriate location for low-income housing and would be better for a project that funds garages.

Chair Maguire announced the ten calendar day appeal period.

Recessed at 5:36 p.m., and reconvened at 5:46 p.m.

**VI. DISCUSSION:**

**ACTUAL TIME: 5:46 P.M.**

**OUTER STATE STREET AREA DISCUSSION:**

Discussion regarding Outer State Street Area traffic conditions. Information and topics of discussion will include: background on prior comprehensive traffic studies, level of service, fees and improvements; status reports on a number of pending projects; current traffic analysis information; public comment; and Commission discussion.

The purpose of the discussion is to take a broad look at the Outer State Street corridor and the areas that feed into it, essentially from Highway 101 on the South to the City limits on the north and west and Alamar Avenue on the east.

Ms. Weiss gave an overview regarding pending projects including analysis of traffic concerns and design in the Outer State Street area. Staff has received input from the public regarding automobile congestion, traffic and the State Street corridor residential areas. Ms. Weiss felt it would be beneficial to have the discussion with the Planning Commission and for the public to have an opportunity to speak regarding upcoming large scale projects proposed for the area. Ms. Weiss emphasized this is not a project-specific review and that individual projects will come before the Planning Commission in the future. Additionally, Ms. Weiss discussed the General Plan Update(GPU) and the future development of Urban Design Resources.

Mr. Dayton gave an overview of the history of Outer State Street, the impacts of individual projects that will be coming before the Commission in the future, current and past levels of standards and ratings, sidewalks and pedestrian crossings, development trends, and residential, commercial and mixed-use trip generation information.

Additionally, Ms. Weiss stated that Staff is assessing all information and will bring to the Commission the complete analysis of each project as the projects proceed through the design review process.

Commissioners' comments and questions:

1. Questioned the future of La Cumbre Plaza, projects currently proposed, the trend for "Five-Points", and future development in that area.
2. Questioned developer fees and revenues collected for traffic mitigation and available funding for possible improvements.
3. Questioned the effect of the proposed eight lanes on 101 and asked about the effect on Outer State Street.

Ms. Weiss stated that La Cumbre Plaza is scheduled for longer range planning and that currently, there is not a development impact fee program but such approaches may be considered in the GPU.

Mr. Dayton stated that the widening of 101 would not pose a dramatic change to outer State Street and that the primary changes would be to the Highway and local street intersections.

The public hearing opened at 6:24 p.m., and the following people:

Barry Berkus, project applicant, believes mixed use makes area vital.

Joe Guzzardi is OK with change and development, but wants less of it. The City LOS standard should be better than D.

Connie Hannah, letter from League of Women Voters, questions traffic analysis; need more discussion.

Kathryn McCammon, also referenced letter from League.

Naomi Kovacks, letter from CPA; enforce zoning codes.

Paul Hernandi, questions regarding cumulative analysis.

Kathy Gebhardt, congestion is not just at peak hours.

Betsy Kramer, read 2<sup>nd</sup> letter from CPA.

Steve Dunn, protect the creeks, scale down.

Jean Holmes, letter for Grove Lane.

Diane Channing, comprehensive planning and design guides needed.

Jim Kahan, letter from Allied; area needs to be beautiful, not intensified

General comments:

1. Sylvia Glass, Grove Lane Neighborhood Association, stated her appreciation to the community and the Commission for great care in the planning of Santa Barbara.
2. Earl Ensberg, Grace Lutheran Church, stated his wish that during the review, projects are treated as reference to their service to the community and are not "lumped together."
3. Gary Earle, Coalition for Sensible Planning, informed the Commission of the future proposed development in East Goleta and asked the Commission take into account future traffic impacts.
4. Eddie Harris, President, Santa Barbara Urban Creeks Council, stated his observations regarding watershed planning and creek side projects and requested the Commission consider foot paths that connect residential to commercial areas to relieve traffic congestion.

With no one else wishing to speak, the public comment was closed at 7:16 p.m.

Commissioners' comments and questions:

1. Asked if there are other issues/resource concerns that warrant a discussion similar to traffic in the Outer State Street Area.
2. Asked about when future planning workshops will be scheduled how seriously will they be considered.

3. Felt there is opportunity for improved design and open space being more accommodating and beneficial.
4. Thought that each design and project is "myopic" in approach and was in favor of a more imaginative, creative, and comprehensive plan for this area with the possible assistance from an outside source.
5. Questioned the zoning and parking requirements for furniture stores versus banks in analyzing the project at 15 South Hope Avenue.
6. Questioned the benefits and/or alternatives to using Institute of Traffic Engineers (ITE) average numbers. Supported the use of ITE but would like to know alternatives available.
7. Noted that bonus density for affordable housing can be appropriate here.
8. Expressed concern regarding 800 future units in eastern Goleta and thought responsible planning needs to take this into account when analyzing the cumulative effects of future development in the area. Does not want to react to a large influx of projects without a good plan in place that considers circulation and distribution.
9. Noted that in Five Points, people fight over parking spaces during the holidays.
10. Noted that, with the trend toward more housing, there may be a need to protect commercial uses to a certain degree.
11. Requested traffic projections.
12. Thought new development will create overcrowding.
13. Thought there should be more discretion regarding the ITE, pros/cons.
14. Stated planning is ongoing, not project oriented.
15. Suggested that the outer State Street area is a "gateway" into Santa Barbara, similar to El Pueblo Viejo in the Downtown.
16. Need to establish a task force to develop new design guidelines for this area.
17. Expressed the need for trolleys and other means of "uptown" transportation in order to relax gridlock. Wider medians could help reduce mid-block crossings.
18. Stated Santa Barbara is unique and there needs to be "unique vision" for upper State Street .
19. Expressed gratitude to the residents of Santa Barbara for the strong participation in the future vision for Santa Barbara.
20. Thought that actual counts, along with the ITE, needs to be implemented to assess traffic. Need to keep traffic counts up to date.
21. Noted that the Outer State Street area is really lacking in public open space; creeks could be a focal point for such open space.
22. Noted that as you go up State Street from Constance Avenue, there is increasing sense of alienation. The situation causes people to drive from the south side of State Street to the north side, instead of walking across the street. This area will change and needs to. May need to consider going to two lanes to encourage movement.
23. Suggested using a land use permit of some sort when uses change to consider effects and appropriate uses.
24. State that, in the Outer State Street area, places that people could drive are separated from places that people drive from. Need to provide mixed use to bring those uses back together and reduce traffic.

25. Mixed use would be beneficial; implementing residential development is positive because it generates less traffic than commercial in this area.
26. The City can move forward on those projects that actually reduce traffic. Need to determine what a good balance is between commercial and residential uses.
27. Stated support for the use of ITE approach. Does not think there are other good alternatives. Likes idea of using local intelligence to the degree we can.
28. Agree that there is a big lack of parks and open space. Suggested that the existing easement along Arroyo burro Creek between Calle Real and Hope Avenue can be extended to State Street as part of the Whole Foods Project.
29. Noted that projects that reduce commercial square footage can use the Transfer of Existing Development Rights to move the square footage to other more appropriate locations.

Ms. Weiss responded that the Creeks Division has completed major public outreach for watershed planning and stated that most projects will proceed through the review process as they are individually proposed. The City of Santa Barbara will be conducting workshops, to begin in the Fall or late this year, to address concerns and hear suggestions regarding the General Plan Update.

Ms. Weiss stated that, although the City of Santa Barbara strives to be as consistent as possible, the ITE standards cannot always be specific; however, the standards have proved to work well for the City as a legal guideline. If the City does not use ITE standards, then review occurs on a case-by-case basis that does not reflect how uses can change over time.

Ms. Weiss added that bonus density can be proposed; however, there are limitations depending on the situation and in protecting various neighborhoods, smart growth concepts are in place and as projects come forward, discussion will ensue regarding bonus density locations. She noted that the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance requires 15% of units in projects with 10 or more units to be affordable; this requirement is usually met using bonus density.

Mr. Dayton expressed that congestion has continued to be reduced since 1979 and that various tests have been completed to calculate current levels and standards.

Ms. Weiss concluded that Planning is moving forward on the General Plan Update, and intends to engage in community-wide discussion, with growth management as a priority. Ms. Weiss added that the Outer State Street Corridor project is a prime example of how Staff can tap into the heart of the community and work with the public in a combined vision for Santa Barbara and that planning cannot be delayed and, in fact, is currently in progress. The Planning Commission can expect future discussions regarding development in this area.

**VII. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA**

A. Committee and Liaison Reports.

None.

B. Review of the decisions of the Modification Hearing Officer in accordance with SBMC §28.92.026.

None.

**VIII. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:26 p.m.

Submitted by,

---

Barbara Walsh, Acting Planning Commission Secretary