



# City of Santa Barbara Planning Division

## PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

June 12, 2008

### **CALL TO ORDER:**

Chair (Pro Tem) John Jostes called the meeting to order at 1:05 P.M.

### **ROLL CALL:**

#### **Present:**

Chair (Pro Tem) John Jostes

Commissioners Bruce Bartlett, Charmaine Jacobs, Addison S. Thompson and Harwood A. White, Jr.

#### **Absent:**

Chair George C. Myers

Vice-Chair Stella Larson

Julie Rodriguez, Planning Commission Secretary

### **STAFF PRESENT:**

Jan Hubbell, Senior Planner

N. Scott Vincent, Assistant City Attorney

Rob Dayton, Principal Transportation Planner

Steve Foley, Supervising Transportation Planner

Debra Andaloro, Senior Planner

Michael Berman, Environmental Analyst

Allison De Busk, Project Planner

Melissa Hetrick, Project Planner

Irma Unzueta, Project Planner

Peter Lawson, Associate Planner

Chelsey Swanson, Associate Transportation Planner

Gabriela Feliciano, Substitute Commission Secretary

### **I. PRELIMINARY MATTERS:**

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

None.

B. Announcements and appeals.

Ms. Hubbell made the following announcements:

1. The appeal for the project located at 565 Yankee Farm Road was denied by the City Council on Tuesday, June 10, with the following added conditions: 1) The house shall be reduced to 85% Floor to Area Ratio (FAR); 2) the tower height shall be reduced; and 3) Staff is to strengthen the conditions of approval regarding construction and post-construction drainage.

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

Chair Jostes opened the public hearing at 1:06 P.M.

1. Sheila Lodge, Chair of the Citizens Planning Association (CPA) – provided booklets with recommendations and suggestions with regard to the General Plan update, including proposed a new Historic Preservation Element, a new section on protecting the urban forest, and suggested policies in the housing and land-use elements.
2. Mary Louise Days, CPA member and local historian– assisted in preparing the historical preservation element section proposed to be included in the General Plan update by the CPA.
3. Paul Hernadi, CPA member – concerns with regard to air quality and housing; suggested adding language about both concerns in the General Plan update.
4. Patricia Hiles, local resident – suggested that future Planning Commission agendas specify when story poles will be installed at project sites for the public's benefit.

Chair Jostes closed the public hearing at 1:15 P.M.

Chair Jostes expressed appreciation for the level of professionalism and thoughtful effort in the preparation of the booklet submitted by the CPA.

**II. CONTINUED ITEM:**

The following item was continued from May 22, 2008.

**ACTUAL TIME: 1:16 P.M.**

**APPLICATION OF TRISH ALLEN, AGENT FOR 800 SANTA BARBARA STREET LLC, PROPERTY OWNER OF 800 SANTA BARBARA STREET, APN: 031-012-028, C-2, COMMERCIAL ZONE, GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: MAJOR PUBLIC & INSTITUTIONAL/OFFICES (MST2006-00129)**

The proposed project involves the demolition of the existing 1,965 square foot one-story commercial building and the construction of a 14,747 square foot, two and three-story mixed-use building containing six residential condominium units and ten commercial

condominiums totaling 4,838 square feet. The residential mix includes five three-bedroom units and one two-bedroom unit, ranging in size from 1,316 square feet to 2,249 square feet. The ten proposed commercial condominiums would be range in size from 400 net square feet to 478 net square feet. Twenty-seven parking spaces are proposed in an underground parking structure, with eleven of those spaces provided per a lease agreement with 223 E. De la Guerra Street.

The discretionary applications required for this project are:

1. A Tentative Subdivision Map for a one-lot subdivision to create six residential condominium units and ten commercial units (SBMC Chapters 27.07 and 27.13); and
2. A Development Plan Approval to allow 2,878 square feet of net new non-residential use (SBMC §28.87.300).

The Environmental Analyst has determined that the project is exempt from further environmental review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Guidelines Section 15332, which allows infill development within urbanized areas.

Case Planner: Irma Unzueta, Project Planner

Email: iunzueta@santabarbaraca.gov

Irma Unzueta, Project planner, gave the Staff presentation. Ms. Unzueta introduced Melissa Hetrick, Project Planner/Environmental Analyst.

Ms. Unzueta acknowledged receipt of two letters from the public:

- 1) Gordon Sichi, Head Master at the Anacapa School; and
- 2) Paula Westbury, local resident.

Brian Cearnal, Architect, gave the applicant presentation. Mr. Cearnal introduced Thomas Foley, Property Owner; Trish Allen, SEPPS; Susan Van Atta, Landscape Architect; Alexandra Cole, Historical Consultant; and David Stone, Archaeological Consultant.

The Commission had the following discussion with the applicant:

1. With regard to surface parking, there is only underground parking proposed; the diagram presented by the applicant showing cars on the surface is only to indicate the entrance to the driveway.
2. The adjacent trees shown on the existing site plan are very close to the property line, but it was confirmed with the applicant's arborist that the trees could be saved because they will be a sufficient distance away from the proposed parking garage.
3. Abutting De la Guerra Street, there are existing agaves that may be removed temporarily and placed back in the ground.
4. The crosswalk along Santa Barbara Street is shown at an angle because it follows the existing walkway.

Chair Jostes opened the public hearing at 1:57 P.M.

The following people spoke in support of the project:

1. David Stone, project's Archaeological Consultant – the report prepared acknowledged Mike Imwalle's finding that the project site is within a recorded archaeological and historical site; no specific archaeological investigations to test precisely the presence or absence of significant archaeological resources within the boundary of El Presidio site; the type of mitigation measure within a portion of the site is to require careful monitoring during construction and Dr. Michael Glassow, serving as the HLC archaeological advisor, considered the Cultural Resources report recommendations to be reasonable and sufficient to address potential impacts related to prehistoric or historical resources on site. The Santa Barbara Trust for Historic Preservation (SBTHP) requested additional information, which was responded to and a testing program was identified to be followed: In consultation with Mike Imwalle, ten shovel test pits were distributed an equal distance apart and located in a way to identify presence of potentially significant resources, including roadways; no significant remains were encountered in the shovel test pits. Dr. Glassow reviewed the new data to determine whether his previous finding should be reconsidered in light of potentially substantial and significant resources. Dr. Glassow agreed that close monitoring of earth moving by a qualified historical archaeologist would be an appropriate measure to ensure that any significant resources that may be present can be identified so that proper treatment may occur.

The following people spoke in opposition to the project or with concerns:

1. Gordon Sichi, the Anacapa School Head Master – unfortunate that the green belt and view of the sky will be reduced significantly; mainly concerned with class time disruption during construction period, complaints from future residents with regard to noise generated by student activities; requested that access to easement at rear of school be maintained during construction; that the white loading zone at the school site be kept open and that demolition be undertaken during the summer.
2. Anne Peterson read a letter from Donald Sharpe, SBTHP Board of Directors, who was unable to attend – concerned with removal of many mature trees on site, size, bulk and scale, and specifically the three-story element which is foreign to neighborhood, not consistent with the Urban Design Guidelines and need to increase setbacks as project is too close to north property line and intersection.
3. Jarrell Jackman, Executive Director of the SBTHP – a full EIR is necessary to assess the impact on El Presidio historic site; concerned with neighborhood compatibility, and parking forced onto the street; and a full archaeological study is needed.
4. Michael Imwalle, Staff Archaeologist for the SBTHP – commented on archaeological resources potentially affected by the proposed project; reviewed the history of El Presidio and its importance in the development of City.

5. Robert Hoover, SBTHP, concerned that the results of additional testing was not reviewed by the Historic Landmarks Commission and requested that a complete report be submitted to the HLC for review.
6. Anne Peterson, read a letter from Dr. Knox Mellon, former California State Historic Preservation Officer – concerned with inadequacy of the original Phase 1 Archaeological Survey leading to faulty recommendations for action by the HLC; the proposal adversely impacts valuable historic resources located in the area adjacent to El Presidio State Park.
7. Mary Louise Days, SBTHP board member and local historian – concerned with environmental effect on cultural and historic resources, views, noise, air pollution, traffic, parking, and urban landscape; trees shown in applicant's presentation are street trees on City land; no other three-story buildings along either frontage of the street for four blocks; concerned that project does not conform to the City's General Plan.
8. Richard Rozzelle, Superintendent for the Channel Coast District of California State Parks – El Presidio site's importance to the State Parks system; high priority to protect resources like El Presidio, including spending millions of dollars to purchase land and complete restoration projects; requested project be sent back to the HLC for further analysis.
9. Barbara Lindemann, SBTHP – commercial part of project most massive and requested it be moved further back from the north property line and that the three-story element be two-story, resulting in less impact to the adjacent one-story building.
10. Kellam de Forest, local resident – further reconstruction of El Presidio will be adversely affected by the proposed project; abutting the wall will hinder the appreciation of the historical resource.
11. Eugene Wilson, CPA Land Use Committee – CEQA exemption not appropriate for this sensitive location and project, requested a full EIR; corner property a critical part of downtown historically and visually; across the street from the Historical Museum, adjacent to the El Presidio and immediately adjoining the Anacapa School; EIR should focus on setbacks, views, archaeology, size, bulk and scale, historic nature of site and health effect of construction on students in the immediate area; concerned with overshadowing of historic atmosphere with modern construction and removal of most of sheltering trees.

With no one else wishing to speak, the public hearing was closed at 2:36 P.M.

The Commission had the following discussion with the applicant and Staff:

1. Staff explained what happens if archaeological resources are encountered during construction.
2. In the shovel test pits, placed as directed by the SBTHP archaeologist, two strata were analyzed. No road or compacted soil was found.
3. The SBTHP brought out new issues mostly with respect to the location drawn of the boundaries of the El Presidio. David Stone considered those issues and included them in his new report. Although SBTHP may not have agreed with the Archaeology Report's

- description, they are not necessarily inaccuracies. Mr. Stone considered the three standards delineated in the MEA to determine significant thresholds for archaeological remains, but concluded that the objects found on the site did not meet any of the criteria.
4. The SBTHP and the California State Park's do not intend to acquire part of the post office in order to complete the preservation of El Presidio. The Anacapa School is already owned by the State Park.
  5. The intent of the CEQA exemption is to provide for certain projects in urban areas (of a certain size and characteristics) that do not typically have significant environmental effects to proceed without further environmental review. The Staff's environmental determination was made based on the findings of the Archaeological and Historic Structures/Sites Reports, both of which were accepted by the HLC, consistent with the procedures in the Master Environmental Assessment. Once the reports were accepted by the HLC, parking and traffic was also looked at, and finally Staff concluded that unusual circumstances did not apply, therefore, an initial study and an EIR or Mitigated Negative Declaration were not required.
  6. There is no easement in perpetuity for the eleven parking spaces provided at the adjacent property and two years are left on the lease.

The Commission made the following comments:

1. The underground parking is commendable for a project of this size.
2. Keeping the historic arcade and the flag pole is appreciated.
3. The applicant's effort to respond to neighbors' concerns is greatly appreciated.
4. The size and scale, parking, and traffic are being dealt with appropriately. The concerns expressed by members of the public are as much an archaeological issue as it is cultural and historical context.
5. There is concern with the three-story element's adjacency to Anacapa School.
6. Compatibility with the neighborhood is important. One Commissioner felt that the project overwhelms El Presidio and the surrounding structures. It is not complimentary to El Presidio.
7. One Commissioner stated that the project is not supportable as presented.
8. Two Commissioners found that the project meets the criteria for Santa Barbara, but not at this site.
9. Two Commissioners found the project to be appropriate to the site as presented with the conditions imposed upon it. Referring it back to the HLC or requesting a full excavation would not be needed, although a historic site is nearby, since one of the conditions is that it shall be closely monitored. The view down De la Guerra Street is important and the applicant is respecting those views. The architecture is thoughtful. A relook of the three-story element is not needed.
10. At least two Commissioners requested that the project be referred back to the HLC to address the concern that there is too much proposed on the site, and for review of aesthetics and provision of more landscaping; but did not find the need for further archaeological review. Three Commissioners did not find a need to refer the project back to the HLC because the studies submitted showed little evidence of significant findings in the requested excavations.

11. It was suggested that an HLC representative attend future meetings where such projects are reviewed by the Planning Commission.
12. At least two Commissioners were not in favor of shrinking the garage because of the impacts it would have on on-street parking in an already congested area.
13. At least three Commissioners would like the garage reduced to add appropriate landscaping, which will help reduce the massing of the building. There is an opportunity for “bona fide treescape” on Santa Barbara Street and should also be provided turning the corner on De la Guerra Street. The landscape plan replacing the acacia trees, which are not necessarily appropriate to the goal of creating an indigenous landscape, is supportable. The bulb-out at the intersection is an improvement to the corner, but adding additional landscape would help buffer the proposed project.
14. With regard to an EIR, one Commissioner commented that it would be more appropriate to come to an agreement by sculpting the project and provide an exemption for the purpose of saving cost and time. Another Commissioner stated that if there were to be an EIR, it would have to be focused on the historic relevance of the site and the visual aesthetics.
15. The time has come to redraw and reanalyze El Pueblo Viejo Landmark District to distinguish it from the central business district.
16. Units 5 and 6 are problematic in that they are viewed straight-on from the roadway and take out the view of the lower foothills, which has been identified as a public resource.
17. It may be less intrusive with a hip roof than the one proposed.
18. The tower (the three-story element) is set back far enough so that it is not too intrusive, but looms over the adjacent school yard. Although not completely compatible with the area, it is sited well and not greatly problematic.

Ms. Hubbell stated that Staff is not requesting further review by the HLC. Additional work done by Mr. Stone did not change the conclusions of the prior Phase 1 Archaeological Report. Staff has amended its recommended conditions of approval for disclosure to future residents and to mitigate construction impacts on Anacapa School in response to the school’s concerns. Ms. Hubbell suggested to the Commission that other appropriate conditions to resolve concerns could be included and the applicant could also be given direction with design changes. Ms. Hubbell pointed out that there is no parking easement for the adjacent parcel. There is no requirement at the end of two years with or without this project that the current property owner maintain the lease for the 11 parking spaces.

Mr. Cearnal expressed concern that, although the HLC has already reviewed the project three times, the applicant would have to start the review process all over again if the Commission was to refer the project back to HLC. He explained that the three-story element (the tower) was designed to not overlook the school yard. There is no classroom activity on that side of the property. As to Unit 5, an effort was made to make the building a “quiet” piece of architecture that is set back. The existing vegetation blocks the mountain views more than the existing buildings. The landscape frontage that exists has been shown maintained in the design. Although a formal site visit was not conducted by the HLC, it is customary for individual members of the HLC to visit project sites. Mr. Cearnal requested direction related to providing more landscaping by removing parking spaces.

The applicant offered to increase the setback to 10' on the Santa Barbara Street frontage.

Ms. Hetrick noted that the effect of the project on the neighboring El Presidio and the entire neighborhood was considered. The HLC requested changes to the Historic Structures/Sites Report to make sure this issue was covered prior to accepting the report.

Mr. Vincent reminded the Commission of its charge at this time, which is the approval of a Development Plan and a Tentative Subdivision Map. The Commission was asked what would be gained from further HLC comments in order to determine whether the residential density and the potential subdivision of the commercial space are appropriate. The size and height of the units are design review issues that will need to be reviewed by the HLC before the applicant receives preliminary approval of the project.

**STRAW VOTES:**

1. How many Commissioners would agree that the project deserves greater landscaping to soften the project's impact on the view down De la Guerra Street with the understanding that some parking may be lost? 5/0.
2. How many Commissioners would agree that the project should be referred back to the HLC? 2/3. (Bartlett/Jostes/Thompson opposed.)

**MOTION: Thompson/Bartlett**

**Assigned Resolution No. 022-08**

Approve the project, making the findings outlined in Section VIII of the Staff Report, subject to the conditions of approval in Exhibit A, and revised with the following conditions of approval: **1)** Increase the landscaping abutting the De la Guerra Street frontage, including deep-rooted trees, as well as the northwest corner along Santa Barbara Street, and the area abutting Anacapa School. A maximum of four parking spaces could be lost and shall be offset by leased parking spaces in the future, if needed. **2)** The setback of the building on Santa Barbara Street shall be increased a minimum of 10 feet. **3)** Soften the northerly elevation adjacent to Anacapa School. **4)** Restripe the crosswalk across Santa Barbara Street to safely align with the pedestrian pathway through the property, subject to review by Transportation and Engineering Divisions for safe alignment of sidewalk. **5)** Future residents shall be informed of the potential for noise as a result of student activities. **6)** Construction impacts to Anacapa School shall be reduced by allowing the loading area in front of the school to remain and not obstructing access to the parking lot.

This motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 3 Noes: 2 (Jacobs/White) Abstain: 0 Absent: 2 (Larson/Myers)

Chair Jostes announced the ten calendar day appeal period.

**\*\* THE COMMISSION RECESSED FROM 3:55 P.M. TO 4:14 P.M. \*\***

**III. NEW ITEM:**

**ACTUAL TIME: 4:14 P.M.**

**WESTERN SIDE OF 600-800 BLOCK OF MILPAS STREET, C-2 ZONE DISTRICT, GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: RESIDENTIAL (MST2008-00228)**

City staff is proposing to initiate a General Plan Amendment which involves the lots between Cota and Canon Perdido Streets, located on the west side of Milpas Street, which are currently zoned Commercial (C-2) and are designated Residential under the General Plan. The proposed General Plan Amendment would change the General Plan designation from Residential to General Commerce. The proposed designation would only apply to those lots that are currently zoned C-2 and no change is proposed to this zoning. The Planning Commission will consider initiation of this General Plan Amendment.

Case Planner: Peter Lawson, Associate Planner  
Email: plawson@santabarbaraca.gov

**RECUSALS:** To avoid any actual or perceived conflict of interest, Commissioner Bartlett recused himself due to currently designing a project within the boundaries of the project area.

Ms. Hubbell requested that the Planning Commission waive the Staff Report.

**MOTION: Thompson/Jacobs**

To waive the Staff Report.

This motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 4 Noes: 0 Abstain: 0 Absent: 3 (Bartlett/Larson/Myers)

Chair Jostes opened the public hearing at 4:18 P.M. and, with no one else wishing to speak, the public hearing was closed.

The Commission made the following comments:

1. The map adjustment will clear the way for more mixed-use projects and potentially for condominiums with both commercial and residential use. It is a good first step to allow projects to move forward.
2. Ortega Park is in desperate need of maintenance. As projects move forward to develop the area, hopes the park will be given consideration for improvement.
3. Since Plan Santa Barbara is in process to update the City's General Plan, suggested that not much time be spent in trying to get it just right.

The Commission had the following question:

1. Is there any circumstance under which a subdivision map or a lot line adjustment could be approved when inconsistent with the map designation?

Ms. Hubbell responded that lot line adjustments for fewer than four lots do not have to be consistent with the General Plan. A tentative map does have to be consistent. A mixed-use project would not be able to move forward with the current General Plan designation.

**MOTION: White/Thompson**

**Assigned Resolution No. 023-08**

To initiate the requested General Plan Map amendment.

This motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 4 Noes: 0 Abstain: 0 Absent: 3 (Bartlett/Larson/Myers)

**IV. ENVIRONMENTAL HEARING:**

**ACTUAL TIME: 4:29 P.M.**

**APPLICATION OF BRENT DANIELS, L&P AGENT FOR KELLOGG ASSOCIATES, 3714-3744 STATE STREET AND 3715 SAN REMO DRIVE, APN 053-300-023, -031, -032 AND 053-222-010, C-P/S-D-2, C-P/R-3/R-4/S-D-3, R-4/S-D-2 AND R-2/S-D-2 ZONES, GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATIONS: GENERAL COMMERCE, OFFICE, RESIDENTIAL AND BUFFER (MST2007-00591)**

The applicant proposes to demolish the existing 113 room Sandman Inn Hotel and all site improvements, and construct a new 106 room hotel and 73 residential condominium units. The project proposes a total of 291 parking spaces (111 parking spaces for the hotel component, 163 parking spaces for the residential component and 17 common/shared spaces). The hotel and residential development would be on separate parcels. The hotel building would be 62,298 square feet, including 19,834 square feet of non-room area (i.e. meeting rooms, corridors, lobby, laundry area, etc.), above a 46,701 square foot underground parking garage. The residential development would have a maximum height of 31 feet above an underground parking garage. Of the 73 residential condominium units proposed (22 one-bedroom units, 14 two-bedroom units, and 37 three bedroom units) 11 (2 one-bedroom units, 4 two-bedroom units and 5 three-bedroom units) would be provided at sales prices targeted to middle-income households earning from 120-160% of area median income, pursuant to the City of Santa Barbara's Affordable Housing requirements.

Ingress to and egress from the proposed hotel and residential development would be provided via separate driveways located off of State Street. Access to the Town and Country Apartments, located immediately behind the subject parcels, is currently provided through the hotel site, and would be permanently closed as part of the project. Access to the Town and Country Apartments would be provided via a new driveway connection off of San Remo Drive.

The purpose of the hearing is to receive comments on the proposed EIR scope of analysis. Written comments on the EIR scope of analysis must be received no later than June 26, 2008 at 4:30 p.m.

Case Planner: Allison De Busk, Project Planner

Email: adebusk@SantaBarbaraCA.gov

Allison De Busk, Project Planner, gave the Staff presentation.

Brent Daniels, Agent, gave the applicant presentation.

Chair Jostes opened the public hearing at 4:45 P.M.

The following people spoke in opposition to the project or with concerns:

1. Paul Hernadi, Citizens Planning Association (CPA) – noted that CPA has identified three issue areas: visual aesthetics, air quality, and transportation. With regard to aesthetics, he identified incompatibility with the neighborhood and loss of urban forest. With regard to air quality, he noted that Santa Barbara does not meet the 8-hour standard and impacts to sensitive receptors due to traffic on State Street.
2. Patricia Hiles, CPA – Continued CPA comments regarding transportation. Noted that the traffic study not accurate and is based on old information; existing traffic should be considered, we need a current baseline; reduction in daily trips inaccurate; extreme development of site; consider demand from hotel meeting room; EIR should evaluate the impacts. Proposed density is too high. EIR needs to look at cumulative impacts.
3. Connie Hannah, League of Women Voters – Glad modifications have been eliminated. Likes unit sizes overall, but there is too much commercial square footage and too many units. Traffic at Hitchcock is already bad; ITE rates for underused parcels are not accurate. EIR needs to deal realistically with traffic and parking. Wants to see Alternatives. Concern with three stories so close to State Street, and air quality impacts. Preserve specimen trees on site. A smaller, more sustainable project is desired.

With no one else wishing to speak, the public hearing was closed at 4:56 P.M.

Chair Jostes stated that the scoping period for public comment ends on June 26<sup>th</sup>.

The Commission had the following discussion with Staff and the applicant:

1. The buffer referred to in the General Plan designation for this site runs east-west behind the area that is generally commercially zoned. It is a buffer between the solid residential areas and the more commercial areas along State Street. What does the buffer mean? Is it a green zone or a transitional area leading to a reduction in height and intensity? The Land Use and Open Space Elements do not make any reference to the “Buffer” designation in the General Plan. It is part of the recreation and open space key on the

- General Plan. If there is no open space buffer that reads, functions, and looks like open space, a General Plan Amendment is needed. Without it, the project description is incomplete. The Buffer designation needs to be thoroughly discussed in the EIR.
2. East-west circulation should not be precluded by the north/south project site design.
  3. Recreational opportunities need to be identified and addressed as described in the Public Services section.
  4. A land use plans and policy analysis needs to be contained in the EIR. The plans and policy consistency must be included in the EIR, not in the Staff Report, so that it is subject to public review and to give the applicant the opportunity to fine-tune the project.
  5. Clarified that the residential and the hotel parking are two separate underground parking garages. The hotel employee parking is contained within the underground parking garage as well. Requested that the EIR evaluate the potential for employee parking spill-over onto the street.
  6. At least two Commissioners would like to have included in the EIR a serious analysis about the commercial office or the hotel taking access using the signalized intersection at Hitchcock. It does not make sense to have a signalized intersection adjacent to the property and then cause traffic friction with a proposed driveway to access the property. The signalized intersection should be used and mid-block crossings and driveways should be avoided.
  7. View analysis should include views of the project itself. The proposed project does not provide an attractive visual aesthetic with its "cookie-cutter" condominiums lined-up in a rectilinear pattern.
  8. Would prefer to see an alternative where there is no Transfer of Existing Development Rights.
  9. More information should be included about the lot line adjustment that would provide an additional 3,000 square feet to the hotel.
  10. Would like to see a discussion of the setback area. It should include planting area in the ground and be able to allow for planting of large trees.
  11. Requested a discussion as to possible mitigations for this project as it is outside the standard walking range for a neighborhood park.
  12. If the lots were merged, could this be considered a mixed-use project? If so, the parking component of the residential could be reduced to one car per unit, rather than two. This would greatly diminish having to do the entire site as a parking garage and would avoid such massive excavation. True landscaping into the ground would be created.
  13. The aesthetics of the Applicant Alternative to the three-story hotel on the corner is preferred.
  14. The intent of the General Plan needs to be reflected with off-site improvements, off-site linkages, and pavement into an open space district.
  15. The EIR should use current traffic figures in its analysis.

Staff responded that the concept of shifting uses from one lot to another has been frequently done and particularly on parcels that have similar or the same zoning. Doing an on site transfer of development within adjacent parcels has been done many times. The baseline for all the resource categories is the existing conditions at the time the

Notice of Preparation (NOP) was issued, which was on May 27, 2008. The analysis for air quality that is proposed in the initial study is only in relation to construction impacts because the construction time-line is very long and a lot of digging is expected on the site. The initial study found that the long-term operational impacts were less than significant.

Mr. Daniels responded that the applicant does not have the legal right to access the site off of the Hitchcock intersection, but has tried to negotiate an arrangement with the current owner with no success.

**V. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA**

A. Committee and Liaison Reports.

1. Commissioners Bartlett and Thompson attended the City Council hearing for the appeal of the project located at 565 Yankee Farm Road. The outcome was reported by Ms. Hubbell in the announcements portion of the meeting.

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

None were requested.

C. Action on the review and consideration of the following Draft Minutes and Resolutions:

- a. Draft Minutes of March 13, 2008.
- b. Draft Minutes of March 20, 2008.
- c. Resolution 012-08 (1298 Coast Village Road)

**MOTION: Thompson/Jostes**

Approve the March 13, 2008, minutes as presented and defer the draft minutes of the March 20, 2008, meeting and its associated resolution to a future meeting.

This motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 2 Noes: 0 Abstain: 2 (As noted) Absent: 3 (Jacobs/Larson/Myers)

Commissioners Bartlett and White abstained from the March 13, 2008, meeting minutes.

**VI. ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION: Thompson/White**

To adjourn the meeting of June 12, 2008.

This motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 4 Noes: 0 Abstain: 0 Absent: 3 (Jacobs/Larson/Myers)

Chair Jostes adjourned the meeting at 5:22 P.M.

Submitted by,

---

Gabriela Feliciano, Substitute Commission Secretary