



# City of Santa Barbara Planning Division

## PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

November 9, 2006

### **CALL TO ORDER:**

Chair John Jostes called the meeting to order at 3:45 P.M.

### **ROLL CALL:**

#### **Present:**

Chair John Jostes

Vice-Chair Charmaine Jacobs (arrived at 4:07 p.m.)

Commissioners, Stella Larson, Bill Mahan, Addison S. Thompson and Harwood A. White, Jr.

#### **Absent:**

Commissioner George C. Myers

### **STAFF PRESENT:**

Bettie Weiss, City Planner

Jan Hubbell, Senior Planner

John Ledbetter, Principal Planner

Debra Andaloro, Environmental Analyst

Barbara Shelton, Environmental Analyst

Kathleen Kennedy, Associate Planner

N. Scott Vincent, Assistant City Attorney

Rob Dayton, Principal Transportation Planner

Stacey Wilson, Associate Transportation Planner

Tully Clifford, Supervising Transportation Engineer

Kathleen Goo, Acting Planning Commission Secretary

### **TRANSPORTATION & CIRCULATION COMMITTEE:**

Keith Coffman-Grey (Chair)

Michael Cooper (Vice-Chair)

Committee Members Bill Boyd, Mark Bradley, Isabelle Greene, Steve Maas, and David Tabor

I. **PRELIMINARY MATTERS:**

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

Ms. Hubbell announced the following changes to the agenda:

1130 N. Milpas Street has asked to be continued.

**MOTION: White/Larson**

To continue Item C, 1130 N. Milpas Street to the November 16, 2006 Planning Commission meeting.

This motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 5 Noes: 0 Abstain: 0 Absent: 2 (Myers/Jacobs)

- B. Announcements and appeals.

No announcements were made.

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

Chair Jostes opened the public hearing at 3:46 P.M. and, with no one wishing to speak, the public hearing was closed at 3:47 P.M.

COMMISSIONER LARSON STEPPED DOWN ON THE NEXT ITEM.

II. **NEW ITEMS:**

**ACTUAL TIME: 3:48 P.M.**

- A. **APPLICATION OF KEVIN DUMAIN OF DESIGNARC, ARCHITECT FOR MARCELA CACERES, 1617 & 1621 ANACAPA STREET, APN 027-182-008 & -009, R-3/R-O, LIMITED MULTIPLE FAMILY RESIDENCE AND RESTRICTED OFFICE ZONES, GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: RESIDENTIAL, TWELVE UNITS/ACRE (MST2005-00409)**

The project consists of a proposal to merge two existing lots and expand the existing 1,334 square foot Bright Start day care center currently located at 1617 Anacapa St. Enrollment would increase from 27 to 60 children. The existing 1,245 square foot apartment located on the first floor of 1621 Anacapa Street would be remodeled to accommodate the expanded day care center and the two second floor apartments would remain. The two required residential parking spaces would be provided onsite. Seven of the eleven parking spaces required for the day care center would be provided through an off-site parking agreement with First Church of Christ, Scientist. Four on street parking spaces along the frontage of the site would be green striped to provide for the loading and unloading of passengers. A new eight foot high acoustical sound fence is proposed along the perimeter of the site.

The discretionary applications required for this project are:

1. Modification to allow encroachments into the required setbacks (SBMC§28.21.085);
2. Modification to allow a parking space to encroach into the required front yard setback (SBMC§28.90.001.9);
3. Modification to allow less than the required number of commercial parking spaces (SBMC§28.90.100.J.18.a);
4. Conditional Use Permit to allow the expansion of the existing day care center (SBMC§28.94.030.G); and
5. Development Plan Approval for 1,245 square feet (net) of new nonresidential square footage (SBMC§28.87.300).

The Environmental Analyst has determined that the project is exempt from further environmental review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines Section 15303 (conversion of small structures).

Case Planner: Kathleen Kennedy, Associate Planner

Email: [kkennedy@SantaBarbaraCA.gov](mailto:kkennedy@SantaBarbaraCA.gov)

Kathleen Kennedy, Associate Planner, gave the staff presentation and stated that the City received 26 letters in support of the project, 3 letters in opposition and 2 letters with concerns.

Marcela Caceres, applicant, gave a brief explanation for the proposed project.

Kevin Dumain, DesignArc project architect, introduced his assistant, Tim Davis, and gave a brief presentation that addressed expansion, safety, parking, noise, and additional site improvements.

Commissioners' comments and questions:

1. Asked what would happen if the off-site parking agreement is discontinued.
2. Asked about parking requirements for the two residential units and for clarification regarding the handicapped stall.
3. Asked how often the City revisits conditional use permits (CUPs).
4. Asked how the Storyteller Child Care Center is doing and if any complaints have been submitted on that project.
5. Asked if any complaints have been submitted for the existing Bright Start Day Care Center.

Ms. Kennedy responded that the parking is a requirement of the project as part of the conditional use permit. Ms. Hubbell added that the City is also a party to the parking agreement and that the applicant would be responsible for informing the City of any termination of the agreement.

Ms. Stacey Wilson, Associate Transportation Planner, responded that the residential units require two stalls. One stall is an unreserved parking space with a loading zone that meets Title 24 of the California Building Code.

Ms. Hubbell responded that conditional use permits are not revisited unless the Planning Commission requests a review period or complaints are received where a revocation of the permit might be considered.

Ms. Hubbell was unaware of any complaints received regarding the Storyteller. There have not been any complaints received on this project.

Chair Jostes opened the public hearing at 4:17 P.M.

**The following members of the public expressed support for the proposed project:**

1. Nigel Gomersall
2. Kelly Knight
3. Kate Bisno
4. Brenda Hahn
5. Carola Nicholson
6. Lynn Rapp
7. Nancy Cuellar
8. Alison Galindo
9. Christine Davis
10. Rafaela Frausto
11. Erika Butler
12. Jim Youngson

**The following members of the public were in opposition to the proposed project:**

1. Jeanne Ullom: noise nuisance
2. Frances Green: insufficient on-site parking/impact on neighborhood off-site parking; noise nuisance

The public hearing was closed at 4:44 P.M.

**Commissioners' comments and questions:**

1. Asked staff what restrictions would be applied to on street parking if the school did not exist.
2. Asked if it would make sense to apply two parking zone standards to the same curb area.
3. Asked if a noise study was done for this project.

4. Asked why additional parking was not sought from the church given the availability of its parking. Asked about any requests for additional off-site parking stalls for drop-offs and staff parking.
5. Inquired about the applicant's intended drop-off process.
6. Inquired about the number of the school's staff.
7. Asked if a stop sign was considered for the Valerio Street and Anacapa Street intersection.
8. Asked about the sound fence construction and if 2-by-4 material could be considered.

Ms. Wilson stated that currently the block has 90 minute parking and would remain as such if the school did not exist. The applicant's request is for a 15 minute zone for the frontage of the property that would most likely be used by parents. Tully Clifford, Supervising Transportation Engineer, responded that the City does have the authorization to apply mixed parking zoning but does not have sufficient parking enforcement staff to provide enforcement.

Mr. Dumain responded that a noise study was not conducted, but a noise consultant provided advice.

Mr. Dumain stated that the requested church parking was based on the project's requirements for staff and volunteers and took into consideration the distance that children would have to be walked to get to the school. Ms. Hubbell added that the parking requirements are based on one space for each staff member and one for every 10 children enrolled, taking into account space for child drop-off.

Mr. Dumain explained the drop-off process. Ms. Caceres added that the 15 minute period drop-off's are staggered between 7:30 a.m and 9:30 a.m and provide ample time for parents to drop off children and walk them to the door.

Mr. Clifford clarified that this intersection did not meet a technical warrant for a stop sign at this time.

Mr. Dumain proposed sound fence construction and was receptive to the use of 2-by-4 material.

#### Commissioners' comments and questions:

1. Finds the program acceptable.
2. Some Commissioners expressed appreciation for the cooperation with the nearby church for additional parking, but one Commissioner felt that parking is still rather tight. Some Commissioners would like the Planning Commission to change condition C.2 to include that the City would be notified if the agreement with the applicant and Church changes. Would like to see the number of required spaces increased to eleven.
3. Most Commissioners would like to see a periodic review of the neighborhood compatibility issue. One Commissioner suggested a two year review to allow the school the opportunity to do self-correction if needed.

4. Most Commissioners expressed concern over noise and asked if a noise study could be requested in the conditions of approval.
5. Inquired about the impact of an 8-foot high fence to attenuate the sound.
6. Some Commissioners desired to have a landscape plan that responds to the noise study. Some Commissioners expressed support for use of 2-by-4 material; one Commissioner requested that the Architectural Board of Review be included in recommending the appropriate height and noise barrier fence material.
7. Not supportive of the parking within the front setback and asked for clarification on the lot zoning. Would support a parking modification.
8. Concern was expressed over the loss of the four bedroom rental unit, but acknowledged that the benefit of the child care project outweighs the concern. The consensus of Commissioners felt that the proposed project provides a public benefit and is needed in the community.
9. Requested clarification on Conditional Use Permit (CUP) and the potential to revise the student size during a review period.
10. Requested clarification on special events and emphasized concern that the facility remains compatible with the neighborhood by adhering to the special event terms in the CUP.

Ms. Hubbell responded that a noise study could be done. This is not an environmental issue, but a neighborhood compatibility situation. If a fence is within five feet of the property line, it must be measured on both sides and a modification would have to be requested if it exceeded eight feet in height.

Ms. Hubbell clarified that one of the lots is actually split zoned R-0 and R-3.

Mr. Vincent stated that the terms of the off-site parking agreement are specified by the Municipal Code and include that the City is a party to the agreement, that the agreement cannot be altered or rescinded without the permission of the City, and requires that the agreement be in a form that is recordable on the property and runs with the property. The certificate of occupancy for the Day Care Center would require a notation in it that, if the parking agreement was altered in such a way that it was not providing the required parking, then the use would have to cease until the parking was obtained in another location or have to cease completely.

Ms. Cacaes stated that the school holds only one special event, a Halloween party each year after hours.

Mr. Vincent addressed changing the CUP during a future review. The CUP is an entitlement to the property. If the Commission were to review this CUP at a later date, it would have to find affirmative evidence that the conditional use is not appropriate for the location before the permit could be altered or revoked.

**MOTION: White/Mahan**

**Assigned Resolution No. 046-06**

Approve the Conditional Use Permit, Yard Modifications, and Development Plan making the finding outlined in the Staff Report; and deny the Commercial Parking Modification,

finding that the reduction of four parking spaces is inconsistent with the purposes and intent of the Zoning Ordinance and may cause an increase in demand for parking spaces in the immediate area, with the following added conditions: 1) The off-site parking Agreement shall include 11 parking spaces; 2) Applicant shall commission a noise study and follow recommendations for landscaping and noise attenuation; 3) Obtain Staff Hearing Officer modification if sound barrier fence is required to exceed a height of 8 feet; 4) Conditional Use Permit (CUP) shall be reviewed in two years by the Planning Commission for neighborhood compatibility; and 5) Include limitation of 1 special event after hours annually and hours of operation (7:30 A.M. – 6:00 P.M., Monday thru Friday) in CUP.

This motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 5 Noes: 0 Abstain: 0 Absent: 2 (Myers, Larson)

Chair Jostes announced the ten calendar day appeal period.

COMMISSIONER JACOBS STEPPED DOWN FROM THE NEXT ITEM.

**ACTUAL TIME: 5:22 P.M.**

**B. APPLICATION OF C. E. “CHIP” WULLBRANDT, AGENT FOR ANDREW AND KENDRA FESHBACH, 730 LAS CANOAS PLACE, APN 021-030-039, A-1, ONE-FAMILY RESIDENCE ZONE, GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: MAJOR HILLSIDE, AND ANDREW EFFRON, 2030 LAS CANOAS ROAD, APN 021-010-060 AND -061, COUNTY ZONING AG-1-10, AGRICULTURAL, MINIMUM TEN ACRES/UNIT AND MISSION AREA DESIGN OVERLAY (MST2003-00327)**

The proposed project consists of a lot line adjustment between 730 Las Canoas Place, located in the City and 2030 Las Canoas Road, located in the County. The lot line adjustment would result in approximately 1.72 acres being added to the 730 Las Canoas Place parcel. The owners of 730 Las Canoas Place currently have a landscape and use easement from the owners of 2030 Las Canoas Road to use the subject property. The proposed project would also require the annexation of the subject property into the City. Each property contains a single-family residence and no new development is proposed. The annexation was initiated by the Planning Commission on September 3, 2004.

The discretionary applications required for this project are:

1. Lot Line Adjustment between 730 Las Canoas Place (APN 021-030-039) and 2030 Las Canoas Road (APN 021-010-060 and -061) (SBMC§27.40); and

Recommendation of approval to City Council of the following actions:

2. Annexation of the subject property from the unincorporated area of Santa Barbara County to the City;
3. General Plan Amendment to add the subject property to the City’s General Plan Map with a designation of Major Hillside;

4. Zoning Map Amendment to add the subject property to the City's Zoning Map with a designation of A-1, One-Family Residence Zone; and
5. Hillside Design District Map Amendment to add the annexed area to the Hillside Design District.

The Environmental Analyst has determined that the project is exempt from further environmental review pursuant to the City California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines Section 15305 (3) (minor lot line adjustments).

Case Planner: Kathleen Kennedy, Associate Planner

Email: [kkennedy@SantaBarbaraCA.gov](mailto:kkennedy@SantaBarbaraCA.gov)

Kathleen Kennedy, Associate Planner, gave the staff presentation.

Mr. C.E. "Chip" Wullbrandt gave the applicant presentation.

Commissioners' comments and questions:

1. Asked about the legalities of the project.
2. Asked about the County concerns on the request for the non-conforming lot line adjustment.

Mr. C.E. Chip Wullbrandt responded that the County parcel will continue to be a non-conforming parcel with the area suggested as currently unusable.

Chair Jostes opened the public hearing at 5:28 P.M.

Ms. Susan Petrovich, representing owner Andy Effron, clarified that when the lot line becomes the property of the Feshbach's, only the Feshbach's are responsible.

The public hearing was closed at 5:36 P.M.

**MOTION: Mahan/Larson**

**Assigned Resolution No. 047-06**

Approved the project as submitted for the lot line adjustment, and recommending to the City Council the following items: to proceed with the annexation, the General Plan Amendment, the Zoning Map Amendment and the Hillside District Map Amendment, including changes to the Conditions of Approval as outlined.

This motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 5 Noes: 0 Abstain: 0 Absent: 2 (Myers, Jacobs)

Chair Jostes announced the ten calendar day appeal period.

**C. 1130 N. MILPAS STREET WAS RE-SCHEDULED TO NOVEMBER 16, 2006.**

**APPLICATION OF LORI A. KARI, ARCHITECT FOR SANTA BARBARA BOWL FOUNDATION, 1130 N. MILPAS STREET, APN 029-201-004, E-1/R-3, ONE-FAMILY RESIDENCE AND LIMITED MULTIPLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE ZONES, GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: RESIDENTIAL, THREE UNITS/ACRE (MST2005-00376) RE-SCHEDULED TO NOVEMBER 16, 2006.**

The proposed project consists of the temporary placement of two 160 square foot storage containers and the installation of six staff parking spaces for use by the Santa Barbara County Bowl located on the adjacent parcel. The storage containers would be screened by the existing hedges. No public access to the project site would be allowed.

The discretionary applications required for this project are:

1. Modification to allow encroachments into the required setbacks (SBMC§28.21.085 and 28.15.085); and
2. Conditional Use Permit to allow a public or quasi-public facility (SBMC§28.94.030.W).

The Environmental Analyst has determined that the project is exempt from further environmental review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Guidelines Section 15303 (new construction of small structures).

Case Planner: Kathleen Kennedy, Associate Planner  
Email: [kkennedy@SantaBarbaraCA.gov](mailto:kkennedy@SantaBarbaraCA.gov)

**\*\*Chair Jostes announced a break from 5:36 P.M. The meeting reconvened at 6:36 P.M.\*\***

III. **JOINT PUBLIC MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION AND TRANSPORTATION & CIRCULATION COMMITTEE MEETING:**

**DISCUSSION ITEM: WORK SESSION ON UPPER STATE STREET TRAFFIC, CIRCULATION, AND PARKING STUDY**

As part of the Upper State Street Study for the commercial corridor between Highway 101 and Calle Laureles, a work session will be held on the Traffic, Circulation & Parking Study prepared for the City by traffic consultant Meyer, Mohaddes Associates. The consultant team will review the study, and the Planning Commission and Transportation and Circulation Committee will receive public comments and discuss options for traffic, circulation and parking improvements for the area.

Transportation and Circulation Committee Members: Keith Coffman-Grey (Chair), Michael Cooper (Vice-Chair), Bill Boyd, Mark Bradley, Isabelle Greene, Steve Maas, David Tabor.

Case Planners: Rob Dayton, Principal Transportation Planner; Barbara Shelton, Project Planner.

Email: rdayton@SantaBarbaraCA.gov; bshelton@SantaBarbaraCA.gov

Mr. Rob Dayton, Principal Transportation Planner, gave the staff presentation.

Mr. Michael Meyer, Traffic Consultant, gave a presentation with additional information on the project.

Commissioners' and Committee's comments and questions:

1. Asked about the number and type of accidents observed in the study.
2. Asked about traffic model and whether it was gravity type model.
3. Asked if this model includes traffic improvements.
4. Asked about the baseline and if all the sites were working at ITE levels.
5. Asked about trip rates in the study.
6. Asked if the study was complete and about additional traffic counts; and if mounted cameras, specifically at State and De la Vina Streets, could be used to count traffic.
7. Asked about obstructions to the public right of way, mid-block driveways, and accidents comparison along the corridor to regular intersections.
8. Asked about short term and long term effects and how study could be used in future, EIRs, and future potential planned for the area.
9. Asked about evaluating S-D-2 Overlay Zone and whether it succeeded in reducing traffic, and what changes would be effective.

Mr. Meyer responded that most of the accidents covered in the study are non-injury accident collisions at moderate speeds with either minor injury accidents with no fatalities observed.

Mr. Meyer clarified that it was not a gravity type model, but base cumulative analysis which includes existing traffic volumes with baseline and ambient growth factors, then explicitly included traffic from individual developments, building a model layer upon layer, and excluding traffic lights at this time.

Mr. Meyer responded that out of 21 sites reviewed using the ITE standard; at least 8 of the sites were lower generating and were then correspondingly compensated to bring them up to the average rate, with the charts reflecting the level of service at the various intersections.

Mr. Meyer stated that the trip rates for the mixed-use developments were based upon ITE trip rates, and adjusting for internal trips; looking at the PM peak hours to be finalized in the final traffic study.

Tully Clifford, Supervising Transportation Engineer, stated that presently the only cameras on the Upper State Street corridor are at the State Street and La Cumbre Street intersection, that the few cameras in the City are limited to bits-and-bite counts, and only two are live cameras.

Mr. Meyer responded that every effort is being considered to make the corridor a pleasant pedestrian experience.

Mr. Dayton explained that the difference between short and long-term improvements are that the short-term improvements are generally low cost and within the immediate control of the City versus higher cost improvements that must be done over time in coordination with land development.

Ms. Shelton clarified that S-D-2 was not scoped for a cumulative effect, but would form future studies.

**Mr. Meyer gave a presentation on parking issues and findings.**

Commissioners' and Committee's comments and questions:

1. Asked about access to the Post Office and whether there have been discussions with the Post Office to improve the parking.
2. Asked about authority to go into parking lots for improvement or enforce management strategies.
3. Asked if there were parking problems at La Cumbre Plaza.
4. Asked about long-term parking issues.
5. Asked about front or rear parking possibilities and restrictions.

Mr. Dayton stated there has not been any discussion with the Post Office to improve parking and circulation.

Mr. Dayton clarified that at this point there hasn't been an attempt to enforce parking management strategies on private property. He noted that La Cumbre Plaza does not generally have parking issues.

Mr. Meyer responded that focus has been on short-term strategies, and improvement options, extended alleys for parking over time.

Mr. Meyer responded that front and rear parking possibilities are determined sometimes by the pedestrian environment, and traffic flow improvements, such as moving the entrances to the parking lots to the side street to alleviate some of the traffic flow.

**Mr. Meyer gave a presentation on improvement options and public input.**

Commissioners' and Committee's comments and questions:

1. Asked about Calle Real study required for Cottage Hospital.
2. Asked about transit center amenities.

Mr. Dayton clarified the Cottage Hospital was required to provide some information regarding access management as a basis for a study. The study will probably start next fiscal year.

Mr. Meyer responded that some future studies might be done to accommodate future amenities for a transit center.

Chair Jostes opened the public hearing at 7:48 P.M.

Ms. Cathy McCammon, League of Women Voters, expressed concern regarding the study, including length of time vehicles spend in the area; traffic study counts during specific times of the day, specifically Fridays and Saturdays; possible missing "trip counts"; access to McKenzie Park; larger shopping parking lots used as commuter lots; artificial barriers; and ultimate goals about what could be done, how long, and how much.

Ms. Connie Hannah, League of Women Voters, stated the study should look at increasing allowed square footage vs. reducing square footage, and requested reducing allowable square footage for small businesses.

Mr. Gil Barry requested that the traffic study be amended for projections through to the year 2030, and that the study and the SBCAG study shows very different results for 2030.

Mr. Scott Schell looked forward to updated information on non-traffic counts, stated that the State Street/Hope Avenue intersection should be recounted, and questioned the comprehensiveness of the study.

Mr. Charlie Eckberg expressed concern that the study did not analyze when the Sandman Restaurant & Grill was open or when the Sandman Hotel had any occupancy; suggested a recount and noted the restaurant will be reopened in January 2007 as the Uptown Brewhouse.

Ms. Michael Self, President of Santa Barbara Safe Streets, expressed concern regarding pedestrian ambiance in favor of more suburban feel, and rear alley parking congestion and security concerns.

Ms. Naomi Kovacs, Citizens Planning Association Land-Use Committee, gave a presentation of comments for consideration for the traffic study, including how long

it takes to travel from one intersection to the next; add mid-day trip counts and level of service; quantify mid-block congestion; reduce zoning modifications; improve air quality and traffic monitoring; and re-examine change of use regulations.

Mr. Paul Hernadi concurred with Ms. Kovacs views as presented.

Mr. Bruce Bartlett, Architectural Board of Review Chair, expressed concern regarding connectivity issues with the neighborhoods, which need to be re-established for the area, did not want bulb-outs, curb outs and other traffic calming devices. He also suggested focusing on the long-term vision.

Mr. David Pritchett, suggested a separate lane for buses only and to sacrifice some rear parking space, and that traffic models could be more comprehensive, including other projects in the region.

Mr. Joe Andrulaitis, concurred with Mr. Bruce Bartlett, and requested that future effects be considered, and that consideration should be given to increased numbers of pedestrians, bicyclists, and a generally more active public; and suggested moving from a suburban model, which is not sustainable, to an urban model.

The public hearing was closed at 8:26 P.M.

Commissioners' and Committee's comments and questions:

1. Commented that strong plans are required.
2. Commented that bicycle counts in Upper State Street area are the only ones in the City to decrease, even with State Street traffic shifting to the U.S. Highway 101, and need to know why. Correspondingly, more adequate corridors should be provided for the public to decrease accidents, and consider long range parking plans to decrease parking lots and increase alternative transportation plans.
3. Commented that report maps show Hitchcock Avenue going to Foothill Road; it stops at State Street. Need to improve State Street entrance to Five Points, Calle Laureles, and State Street intersection with left-turn lanes. Area should have fewer driveways. Traffic study shows traffic is less at the west end than at east end. Include Friday traffic counts. Need to know how bus improvements will affect traffic. Need more bus cut-outs. Look for bicycle connections south of State Street between Las Positas Road and Five Points. Require bike racks and showers for businesses. Need standard sidewalk width for entire area; put parkway between pedestrians and traffic. Support trails on creeks extending north from State Street. Pedestrians need paseos through commercial areas to neighborhoods.
4. Commented that the traffic study needs to have long-range vision and be bold on how to get there, while doing some short-term fixes.
5. Wanted to hear specifics from Mr. Bartlett and Mr. Andrulaitis on long-term vision. Add a grid if possible. State Street isolates north from south. Each developer needs to know that connectivity to neighborhoods is required. Need wider sidewalks for pedestrians. Asked if it is at intersections where views are preserved with development in-between. City should be involved in communal parking structures

- by getting property owners involved. State Street west of U.S. Highway 101 will be in the City and really needs work too.
6. Commented that inter-block congestion needs to be better evaluated and improved in the short-term as there will be more traffic intensity on the south side of State Street, and plans should reflect that going west on State Street the sun can be blinding. Private parking is not as efficient as public parking; reduce paving in long-term; there is too much now. The Planning Commission needs tools and guidelines to direct developers for future improvements as upper State Street development evolves.
  7. Commented that a downtown-style parking district should be considered. State Street is an emergency thorough fare that should be respected.
  8. Commented that improvements for connectivity to the neighborhoods should be considered; and that there should be some comparability between the study area and outside the area, including the SBCAG study; and medians need to be extended to force drivers to use cross-streets.
  9. Commented that buses should move more smoothly through the area, and pedestrian use could be increased, mixed-use development encouraged.
  10. Commented that through traffic, more way-findings to improve pedestrian maps of the area, bus pullouts into traffic, bike path (on UP) should be improved and merits more study. Consider directional signing for tourists.
  11. Commented that the long-term should also be considered, and suggested a review to compared to the 1924 Study. Also look at regional traffic. Noted that SBCAG study includes diversion from U.S. Highway 101 as highway traffic worsens.
  12. Commented that the City should make sure that the suburban planning approach is not exacerbated and preferably improved. Consider slowing traffic down on Upper State Street, similar to Coast Village Road and add a transit lane. Noted that Ficus trees in sidewalk will stay, so work with them. Consider looking at “walk-sheds,” i.e., what pedestrians can walk to in a quarter-mile and show on maps. The highest short-term priority is safety-resolve vehicle conflicts.
  13. Commented that civic engagement process has been excellent. Study does not go far enough into neighborhoods. Need to increase connectedness and change from parcel-by-parcel to block-to-block vision. Offer 12 initiatives, including: shuttles through neighborhoods; mini-transit center; identify where to put decked parking in next 5-10 years; figure out how to get more right-of-way at the southwest corner of State Street and Hope Avenue; look at decked plaza with parking below; look at where new streets can be added; add paseo-style connections between San Remo Drive and State Street; provide better linkage between Samarkand and McKenzie Park; turn alleys behind State Street into one-way streets; provide narrow “roadways” for small electric vehicles; create a partnership between YMCA and Circuit City properties to establish a pedestrian connection between Hitchcock and Hope Avenues; increase budget for Community Development Department to provide more staff to implement improvements and analyze other areas; City to initiate a specific plan for public improvements through La Cumbre Plaza; and provide a bicycle and pedestrian path from the Municipal Golf Course to Five Points.

14. An announcement was made that the deadline to receive public comment is Friday, November 17, 2006.

Mr. Dayton addressed issues of perception considering congestion overflows, and that staff is updated on all current information.

Commissioner Jacobs asked that the Commission and the public remember our War Veterans this Veterans Day, and suggested a visit to the "Local Heroes Among Us" display in the entrance lobby of City Hall for our active and memorialized Veterans.

#### IV. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

- A. Committee and Liaison Reports.  
None were given.
- B. Review of the decisions of the Staff Hearing Officer in accordance with SBMC §28.92.080.  
None were requested.
- C. Action on the review and consideration of the items listed in V.C. of this Agenda.
  1. Draft minutes of October 12, 2006.
  2. Resolution 041-06  
2020 El Camino de la Luz.

**Review of October 12<sup>th</sup> minutes and resolution was continued to the November 16, 2006.**

#### VII. ADJOURNMENT

**MOTION: Jacobs/Mahan**

Adjourn the meeting.

This motion carried by the following vote:

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

Chair Jostes adjourned the meeting at 9:18 P.M.

Submitted by,

---

Kathleen Goo, Acting Planning Commission Secretary