



# City of Santa Barbara Planning Division

## PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

April 14, 2005

### **CALL TO ORDER:**

The meeting was called to order at 1:09 p.m.

### **ROLL CALL:**

#### **Present:**

Chair Jonathan Maguire

Vice-Chair John Jostes

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

#### **Absent:**

None.

Commissioner White arrived at 1:12 p.m.

Commissioner Larson arrived at 1:16 p.m.

Commissioner Jacobs arrived at 1:18 p.m.

### **STAFF PRESENT:**

Bettie Weiss, City Planner

Jan Hubbell, Senior Planner

Allison De Busk, Associate Planner

Victoria Greene, Project Planner

Susan McLaughlin, Assistant Transportation Planner

Jessica Grant, Associate Planner

Laurie Owens, Project Planner

Owen Thomas, Supervising Civil Engineer

Renee Brooke, Assistant Planner

Susan Knecht, Assistant City Attorney

N. Scott Vincent, Assistant City Attorney

Liz N. Ruiz, Senior Recording Secretary

## **II. PRELIMINARY MATTERS:**

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

Senior Planner Jan Hubbell announced, per the request of the applicant, that 210 Meigs Road is being continued to April 21, 2005.

B. Announcements and appeals.

Ms. Hubbell announced the resignation of Jessica Grant, Associate Planner.

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

With no one wishing to speak, the public comment was opened and closed at 1:10 p.m.

**III. CONSENT ITEMS:**

**ACTUAL TIME: 1:10 P.M.**

**APPLICATION OF SOPHIE CALVIN, AGENT FOR MR. AND MRS. STEVE WINGER, PROPERTY OWNERS, 2020 EDGEWATER WAY, APN: 045-100-062, E-3/S-D-3 SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE AND COASTAL OVERLAY ZONES, GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: RESIDENTIAL – 5 UNITS PER ACRE (MST2004-00745; CDP2005-00002)**

The project consists of a proposal to construct an 867 square foot second-story addition to an existing 1,825 square foot single-family residence with an attached two-car garage on an 8,548 square foot lot located within the City's Coastal Zone.

The discretionary application required for this project is a Coastal Development Permit for development in the 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 Act Guidelines Section 15301 (addition to an existing facility).

**MOTION: Mahan/Myers**

To waive the reading of the staff report.

This motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 4 Noes: 0 Abstain: 0 Absent: 3 (Jacobs, Larsen & White)

With no one wishing to speak, the public comment was opened and closed at 1:11 p.m.

Sophie Calvin, Agent for property owners, addressed the Planning Commission stating that she was available for questions, and would not be making a presentation at this time.

Commissioners' comments and questions:

1. Feels there are no basic problems with this application, but the architecture is an issue. Does not find design, as presented, to be compatible with the neighborhood. Feels that neighborhood compatibility should still be an issue for the ABR when they make neighborhood preservation findings. Would like to request that ABR make a site visit in order to address neighborhood compatibility.
2. Stated there is an adobe house up the street that would be a nice example of what is consistent of the neighborhood.

**MOTION: Mahan/White**

**Assigned Resolution No. 027-05**

Make the findings outlined in the staff report and approve the Coastal Development Permit with the conditions of approval amended to include recommending a site visit by the Architectural Board of Review to view the architecture of the other houses on the street, and reconsider the design to be more compatible with the neighborhood by focusing on a nearby adobe house as the best example, and include materials such as recessed windows, two piece mission tile, and high quality design.

Comments to the motion:

Chair Maguire asked if in the findings for the Coastal Development Permit it says, the residential addition would be compatible with the existing residence and the neighborhood. Is this normally what they are finding? Ms. Hubbell clarified.

This motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 7 Noes: 0 Abstain: 0 Absent: 0

Chair Maguire announced the ten calendar day appeal period.

**IV. NEW ITEMS:**

**ACTUAL TIME: 1:24 P.M.**

**A. APPLICATION OF ISAAC ROMERO, AGENT FOR SANTA BARBARA COTTAGE HOSPITAL AND SONA STAR INC., PROPERTY OWNER, 316 W. MONTECITO STREET, APN 037-232-006, C-2/COMMERCIAL ZONE, GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: GENERAL COMMERCE (MST2004-00746)**

The applicant requests approval of a conditional use permit for operation of a community care facility for residential chemical dependency treatment for up to 24 persons to be operated by Santa Barbara Cottage Hospital. The proposed facility would replace an existing facility for 14 patients located at 2838 State Street. The proposed facility would occupy an existing 23 room motel. Physical development would include interior alterations, structural improvements to meet building code requirements, parking lot reconfiguration and the addition of a security gate. Fourteen parking spaces would be provided onsite.

The discretionary approval required for the project is a Conditional Use Permit to allow the operation of a community care facility for up to 24 persons in the C-2 (General Commercial) zone district (SBMC §28.94.030.R).

The Environmental Analyst has determined that the project is exempt from further environmental review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Guidelines Section 15301, Existing Facilities.

To avoid the appearance of a conflict of interest, Commissioner Larson stepped down at 1:24 p.m.

Victoria Greene, Project Planner gave a staff presentation.

Commissioners' comments and questions:

1. Asked for clarification regarding the Transportation Demand Management Program.
2. Asked what the Knox box means on the pedestrian gate. What sort of control mechanism is on the pedestrian gate.
3. Stated if this weren't Cottage Hospital, the Commission would probably require MTD bus passes be provided to the employees, and if you weigh these two options, the Cottage plan versus the free MTD bus pass, how do you compare.
4. Asked if, in granting a CUP looking specifically at a limited patient population, would there be a trigger should Cottage decide if they want more patients on this site or use the site for out-patient services.

Susan McLaughlin, Assistant Transportation Planner, clarified the Transportation Demand Management Program and the Knox box.

Ron Biscaro, Santa Barbara Cottage Hospital, addressed the Planning Commission and introduced Dr. Paul Erickson and Craig Park.

Dr. Paul Erickson, Medical Director of Psychiatry and Chemical Dependency, Santa Barbara Cottage Hospital, addressed the Planning Commission.

Craig Park, Program Director for Mental Health Services, Santa Barbara Cottage Hospital, addressed the Planning Commission.

Isaac Romero, described the project's neighborhood and land use.

Kristin Story, Project Architect, Santa Barbara Cottage Hospital, addressed the Planning Commission.

Lisa Moore, Vice President Clinical Services, Santa Barbara Cottage Hospital, addressed the Planning Commission.

Commissioners' comments and questions:

1. Asked what window screens Architectural Board of Review had concerns about.
2. Stated that, for the four-story residential building on Haley Street, a window was used that met code requirements on the property line; curious if that has been investigated.
3. Asked if patients would be on any medication; and if there is going to be any security.
4. Asked if there will be additional housekeeping and meal personnel on site, and whether they were counted in traffic analysis.

5. Asked what happens after client's 28-day stay; double occupancy; is there a waiting list; how do people find out about the program; how they interface with other agencies.

The public hearing opened at 2:12 p.m.

The following people spoke in favor of the project:

David Rock

Faith Kleveland

Angela Holand-Zimmer, Domestic Violence Solutions

Joan Wilkin (also read a letter in support of the project from Barbara M. Long, Owner, Brewhouse)

Arnold Gowans

Les Jones, Full Spectrum Recovery

Michelle Falvey, Council on Alcoholism and Drug Abuse

Bob Hopkins

The following people spoke in opposition to the project:

Lee Scharfeld

Alan Fenton

Glenn Nichols, The Orchid Inn

Bonnie Donovan, Donovan Electric

The following person spoke and stated her concerns:

Janet Bullock, Eagle Inn

The public comment was closed at 3:07 p.m.

Commissioners' comments and questions:

1. Stated it is always challenging to weigh the neighborhoods concerns with the community-at-large concerns; community needs these facilities, question is, is this a valid location.
2. Feels bed tax is a wonderful resource for the City and is a loss; however, this is a needed facility and supports it. Would like to hear discussion regarding traffic.
3. Stated the notion of this being a homeless shelter, it is not, it is a facility where high commitment is taking place to get better.
4. Would like a report back in a year or two.
5. This project lends itself to the CUP process, and if concerns come up they can deal with it.
6. Stated when making the findings, does not feel they are being ignorant, but rather it is a good quality facility.
7. Does not see the security issue as a factor; however, the signage, bicycle rack, and parking need to be looked at further.
8. Has concerns about location and logistics, however, feels we can find common ground that will work for the neighborhood and Cottage.
9. Stated there cannot be street parking for patients and staff. Would like to see the parking spaces parallel to improve the visibility going out.
10. Visibility and request for an encroachment into setback on the street; worth considering not recommending that much of an encroachment and moving the gate and the wall.
11. Concerned about the neighborhood, giving up the shopping and commercial visitors, and possibility creating a dead zone.

12. Would not like to close the door on the neighbors concerns if in five years it comes back because it is not working.
13. Asked why there is a gate.
14. Not concerned about bed tax and would also like to see a report in two instead of five years.
15. Asked staff to go over the parking issue as it is the only problem he sees with the project.
16. Would like for signage to be very discreet.
17. Stated the proposed bicycle parking area appears to be a very tight squeeze.
18. Thanked the neighbors of the facility for dealing with the impacts of living in a community, and satisfied that the signage will be appropriate; however, is a little concerned about peak parking demand.
19. Feels there is a concern about pedestrian safety in backing out because of the traffic in the area.

Ms. MacLaughlin addressed the PC in regard to their questions regarding parking spaces as well as the gate.

Mr. Schell addressed the PC on the issue of the gate and parking.

Ms. Story addressed the PC regarding the proposed sign.

**MOTION: Mahan/Jostes**

**Assigned Resolution No. 028-05**

Make the necessary findings and approve the Conditional Use Permit; with amended conditions of approval, as follows:

- require additional bicycle parking bollards in parkway;
- eliminate catering and cleaning/maintenance functions during visiting hours;
- let staff, applicant, and traffic engineers figure out the best parking situation;
- report back to the Planning Commission in 2 years;
- signage to go to the Sign Committee; and
- add condition on Transportation Demand Management similar to Cottage Hospital condition

Comments to the motion:

Commissioner Myers stated he is curious as to the impact of catering as he feels it is not a major impact. His concern was addressed and he withdrew his concern.

This motion carried by the following vote:

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

Chair Maguire announced the ten calendar day appeal period.

Mr. Biscaro thanked the Planning Commission.

Chair Maguire called for a recess at 3:47 p.m.

Chair Maguire reconvened at 4:04 p.m.

**V. DISCUSSION ITEM:**

**ACTUAL TIME: 4:04 P.M.**

**AIRLINE TERMINAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECT**

Review of key issues pertaining to the Airline Terminal Improvement Project design and recommendations to the City Council on key issue policy statements to guide development of the Terminal Program Criteria Document.

Laurie Owens, Project Planner, gave a presentation of the project.

The public hearing was opened at 4:15 p.m., and with no one wishing to speak, was closed.

Commissioners' comments and questions:

1. Question that dates back a couple of years regarding the one story/two story debate; various airline companies have expressed concern about cost of two-story construction; questioned if there a major financial contribution from the Airlines on the two-story option.
2. Complimented staff on the Project Criteria Document (PCD) approach to negotiating a good quality airport.
3. Would like to see LEED incorporated into policy statement.
4. Surprised and pleased with consensus on what needs to be done at the airport whether it is one, two, or three story as long as we capture the wonderful experience of flying into Santa Barbara.
5. Issue whether aircraft load from the ground floor or second story; in the end, have to do both because this is a regional airport with a mix of aircraft; architect will have to struggle with splitting of the passengers, and accessibility is an important thing.
6. Feels we are headed in the right direction, and going as fast as we can go.
7. Compliment collaborative effort and feels it has worked out well, impressed with the Historic Landmarks Commission comments in that we use the latest technology.
8. Asked if glass loading bridge is a telescopic bridge?
9. Very fine design process; level of expertise around the table is remarkable and expects to see an award winning terminal. Consider additional language in the first section on the Santa Barbara Airport experience to incorporate landscaping. Also, in the last line, add on the Santa Barbara Airport experience not only public art and display of area history, but also environment of the region to acknowledge the wetlands that are part of the airport property.
10. Agrees the phrasing from one-story or two-story building should be changed to either/or. Use the term "massing" instead of one-story vs. two-story.
11. Interesting project; happy that seven years later it is happening.
12. Feels the public would like to see a balance between traditional and modern and is encouraging as much square footage as needed for future good planning.
13. Feels you could get a lot of space with a three-story structure, and feel disappointment that they are not planning a parking structure; maybe when money becomes available, airport

could reconsider. Concerned about the LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) issue.

14. Feels that a key policy issue is missing and that is MTD and the integration of transit into the airport terminal; feels it is extremely important and is an issue that should be forwarded to City Council.
15. Will not support a one-story terminal; need a two-story terminal. Many reasons not to have an exclusively one-story building.
16. Would like to see a parking structure; and feels revenues should allow construction of a parking structure. Also, feels Cottage Hospital should be used as an example as opposed to Granada Garage. Consider possibly raising fees at the airport to push parking structures a little bit farther, and feels it is not appropriate to have additional parking off Hollister at the old theater site as parking should be consolidated in the terminal area.

Owen Thomas, Supervising Civil Engineer, responded in regard to the one-story/two-story airport issue.

Nabil Jammal, Architect, URS Corporation, responded regarding architecture.

**MOTION: Mahan/Jacobs**

**Assigned Resolution No. 029-05**

Recommends that the City Council adopt the Airline Terminal Improvement Project Design policies with the changes recommended by the Architectural Board of Review and the Historical Landmarks Committee, with the following additional changes:

To "The Santa Barbara Airport Experience," add:

- Lush landscaping, courtyards, benches and useable lawn areas
- The new Terminal building should marry historic architecture with modern technology and need not be a literal example of Spanish Colonial Revival Architecture but instead "be courageous" and "push the envelope" of Hispanic design, incorporating both traditional and modern design elements.
- Public art and displays of the history and environment of the region and the Airport

Add "Public Transit," as follows:

Transit and shuttle service access shall be enhanced as part of the Terminal project. Consistent with the Aviation Facilities Plan (AFP) and AFP Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR), a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Plan shall be developed for the Terminal area. The new Terminal Loop Road shall incorporate a lane to accommodate sufficient parking and queuing area for buses, shuttles, taxis and limousines. As part of the TDM plan, work with MTD to provide a better bus stop at the Terminal and to coordinate bus service with flight schedules.

This motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 7 Noes: 0 Abstain: 0 Absent: 0



Chair Maguire announced the ten calendar day appeal period.

**VI. NEW ITEM**

**ACTUAL TIME: 4:42 P.M.**

**APPLICATION OF WYNMARK CO., AGENT FOR WYNPAC IV, LLC (PROPERTY OWNER), 1156 NORTH ONTARE ROAD, APN 055-160-028, A-1/SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL ZONE, GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: RESIDENTIAL, 1 UNIT/ACRE (MST2004-00196).**

The project involves the division of a 14.77-acre (gross) parcel into nine lots, ranging in net size from 0.94 acre to 5.59 acres, for future residential development. Infrastructure improvements related to the subdivision are proposed, including a new public road, curb, gutter, public drainage system and utilities, private bioswale drainage feature, residential street lights, and fire hydrants. Although development of the newly created lots is not proposed at this time, development and building envelopes have been proposed for each lot. The proposed project requires the following discretionary applications:

1. A Conditional Use Permit to allow a Planned Residence Development (PRD) in the A-1 Zone (SBMC §28.94.030.G);
2. A Tentative Subdivision Map to allow the division of one parcel into nine lots (SBMC Chapter 27.07);
3. A Modification to allow the existing garage on proposed Lot 7 to encroach into the required 15-foot interior yard setback (SBMC §28.92.026);
4. A Modification to allow proposed Lot 5 to provide less than 100 feet of frontage on a public street (SBMC §28.15.080); and
5. A Modification to allow proposed Lot 6 to provide less than 100 feet of frontage on a public street (SBMC §28.15.080).

The Planning Commission will also consider approval of the Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared for the project (ENV2004-00196) pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines Section 15074.

To avoid the appearance of a conflict of interest, Commissioner Jacobs stepped down at 4:32 p.m.

Renee Brooke, Associate Planner, gave a presentation of the project.

Commissioners' comments and questions:

1. Asked to go over the thinking behind requesting a modification for lot #1 and the street dimension there, and not adjusting the lot line on lot #8 to accommodate an adequate setback for the garage on Lot #7.

2. Questioned the Planned Residence Development (PRD) approach as he is not clear what the purpose is. Is the legislative intent of the PRD for more open-space that is available to the public in general?
3. Stated he would like to see the parcel study that shows the slope density criteria being met as he did not see that in this package,
4. In regard to Lot #7 with the historic resource and lot #6, which also has a historic resource; what would be required to subdivide lot #7, which is about 6 acres, in the future.
5. With respect to the second building envelope in lot #7; what is possible for that, is the lot big enough for two residences?
6. Recalls at the environmental hearing, that drainage issues were a concern to the neighbors, and in reviewing the staff report, feels this issue has been dismissed.
7. Appears that the width of the Flood Control District easement on the adjacent property to the east is larger than the roadway shown on the subject property; is there a reason for that, and as part of this project are they are going to realign the existing easement?

Ms. Hubbell responded by providing background and information on the Planned Residence Development Ordinance.

Mark Linehan, President, Wynmark Company, and applicant, Kim Schizas, Wynmark Company, and Bob Flowers, Flowers Associates, presented the project and answered questions.

Peter Brown, Attorney for the project, responded regarding comments by the Commission at the December hearing; indicated how the conditions of approval respond, how the project has been modified, and addressed one condition they have concerns about.

Mr. Linehan once again addressed the PC and spoke about a resident who is now living in the small cottage on the property and that they would like to remain there, and went over some drainage issues.

The Planning Commission asked the following additional questions:

1. Asked Mr. Flowers for an explanation of the proposed detention trenches, and if the designs are schematic. Would access to Lot #1 be taken off Ontare Road or the proposed cul-de-sac?
2. Asked if applicant could elaborate on the extent they have gone to create a buffer for the neighbors to the north.

The Public Hearing opened at 5:40 p.m.

The following people spoke, expressing their concerns:

Sandra Castellino  
Bernice Alexander  
Edward Mullen  
Tim Sullivan

Ron Lance  
Gretchen Mariani

The following people spoke in support of the project:

John Elleston  
Walter Krieg

The public comment was closed at 6:01 p.m.

There was discussion among the Commission and applicant to continue this hearing.

Mr. Linehan once again addressed the Commission, clarifying and addressing public testimony concerns.

The public comment was reopened at 6:18 p.m., and the following person raised additional concerns:

Sandra Castellino

**MOTION: Mahan/Jostes**

To continue this item to April 28, 2005 at 3:00 p.m.

Comments to the motion:

The Planning Commission would like the following information at the next hearing:

1. More information on the drainage solutions, more information on sub-surface drainage flow when the land is saturated with water and how the collection basins would work, and would be interested in hearing more about bio filtration and having this project become a model.
3. Discussion of street lights.
4. Explain the eucalyptus tree set back.
5. Information from the Fire Department to talk about the width of Ontare Road and evacuation in case of wildfire.
6. Discuss onsite utility lines.
7. Discuss how manure would be handled and not get down into the creek.
8. Discuss the size of the building envelopes
9. Discuss how the mitigation monitoring plan would apply to future development.
10. Asked Public Works staff to talk very specifically about Ontare Road, foot by foot.
11. Information about providing residents access to Stevens Park, which is adjacent to them. Consider a trail.

This motion carried by the following vote:

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

At 6:13 p.m., the Planning Commission went on to address the Administrative Agenda.

**VII. DINNER BREAK:**

**ACTUAL TIME: 6:20 P.M.**

Chair Maguire recessed for dinner at 6:20 p.m.

Chair Maguire reconvened the meeting at 7:39 p.m.

Commissioner Jostes left the meeting during the dinner break.

**VIII. DISCUSSION ITEM:**

**ACTUAL TIME: 7:39 P.M.**

**APPLICATION OF PEAK LAS POSITAS PARTNERS, 900-1100 BLOCK OF LAS POSITAS ROAD (VERONICA MEADOWS SPECIFIC PLAN), APNs 047-010-016, 047-010-053 (A PORTION), 047-010-009, 047-010-011, AND 47-061-026; CURRENT COUNTY ZONING: 8-R-1 SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL (8,000 SQ. FT. MIN. LOT SIZE), AND RR-20 RURAL RESIDENTIAL (20-ACRE MIN. LOT SIZE); CURRENT COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN DESIGNATION: RESIDENTIAL, 4.6 UNITS PER ACRE AND RESIDENTIAL RANCHETTE, ONE UNIT PER 20 ACRES (MST99-00608).**

The proposed project involves the annexation of approximately 50 acres to the City of Santa Barbara. Upon annexation, Assessor's Parcel Numbers (APNs) 047-010-009, 047-010-011, 047-010-016, 047-061-026 and a 4.49-acre portion of APN 047-010-053 are proposed to have various General Plan Land Use Designations, including Residential (Two Dwelling Units/Acre), Major Hillside, Open Space, Buffer/Stream, and Pedestrian/Equestrian Trail. The proposed Zoning designation for most of the property is SP-8/SD-3 [Specific Plan/Coastal Overlay Zone (for the portion within the Coastal Zone)].

The project also includes a Tentative Subdivision Map (TSM) to create 30 lots contingent upon the annexation of the subject properties. Twenty-four (24) of the proposed lots would contain single-family residences, four lots would be dedicated open space, one would be for the proposed public road, and one would be for the completion of the Alan Road cul-de-sac. The proposed residential lot sizes would range from 5,520 square feet (sq. ft.) to 14,140 sq. ft.

Site access would be provided via a concrete bridge that would cross over Arroyo Burro Creek and intersect with Las Positas Road. A traffic signal is proposed at this new intersection. The existing end of Alan Road would be improved with a cul-de-sac and two new homes would front on the new cul-de-sac. No through vehicular access from Alan Road is proposed by the applicant. A sidewalk is proposed along both sides of the new bridge and along one side of the new public road.

Approximately 97 trees would be removed, in addition to the native and non-native vegetation in the areas of proposed grading. The project includes a creek/riparian corridor restoration plan on both banks of Arroyo Burro Creek, oak tree protection plan, and landscaping associated with the new homes and open space areas. Two separate areas of creek bank repair are proposed east of proposed Lot 7.

The project provides a 100-foot buffer between the proposed residences and the top of bank of Arroyo Burro Creek, or edge of riparian corridor, whichever is greater. Development rights would be restricted within the first 50 feet of this area (closest to the creek); a portion of the proposed public road and private driveways would be located within the 100-foot creek setback. A five-foot public pedestrian path is proposed along the western edge of Arroyo Burro Creek, to provide access from the end of Alan Road to Las Positas Road, via the proposed bridge.

Cast-in-ground concrete caissons are proposed on-site to stabilize the hillside. Total estimated grading for the project improvements (homes, roads, etc.) would be approximately 13,459 cubic yards (c.y.) of cut and 10,390 c.y. of fill. Geologic stabilization of the hillside would result in approximately 61,500 c.y. of cut and 61,500 c.y. of fill.

Drainage would consist of underground storm drains, bioswale inlets, swales, and surface sheet flow. In two locations, storm drains would be constructed to daylight in Arroyo Burro Creek. Rock rip-rap would be placed at the terminus of the storm drains to diffuse project run-off discharged at these locations. The project would be served by Santa Barbara City water and sewer services.

**The purpose of this hearing is to discuss development options on the Veronica Meadows project site. While no formal action on the discretionary applications associated with the project will be taken at this hearing, the Planning Commission will discuss and comment on the proposed project and provide direction to Staff and the Applicant regarding the preferred site design. A separate hearing will be scheduled for the Planning Commission to consider certification of the Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and formal action on the requested discretionary applications.**

Renee Brooke, Associate Planner, gave an overview of this project.

Commissioners' comments and questions:

1. Stated that there has been some talk about a roundabout at Cliff/Los Positas intersection; where is the City with that process?
2. Asked what are the other mitigations; would the applicant be required to contribute to the Project Study Report for Highway 101 between Las Positas and Mission?
3. Asked if there is a project proposed on the parcel at the northwest corner of Cliff Drive and Las Positas Road.
4. Asked what sort of expectation is on this project because it has been around for a while now.

Rob Dayton, Supervising Transportation Planner, stated that a roundabout at Cliff Drive and Las Positas Road has been designed in concept and is mostly funded. He further explained how the traffic mitigation funding has been spread in the EIR.

Ms. Hubbell stated the owner of the parcel at Cliff and Las Positas has initiated annexation, but has not submitted a complete application. She stated that decisions on Mr. Lee's project are expected to be this year.

Mr. Lee, Applicant, addressed the Commission and noted that his team will give brief presentations.

Jeff Gorrell, Architect, addressed the Commission regarding the history of the development.

Dan Meade, Biologist, addressed the Commission regarding biological resources on the proposed project.

Mitchell Swanson, Fluvial Geomorphologist, addressed the Commission regarding the current condition of Arroyo Burro Creek, and provided a conceptual description of the proposed restoration.

Chair Maguire opened the public comment at 8:45 p.m.

The following people addressed the PC in support of the project:

Patricia Foley, Braemar Ranch Homeowners Association

Jan Abel

Sandy Rice

Diana Bull

Robert H. Uphoff

Jeff DeVine

Jo Wagner

Daniel McCarter

Don Rice

Gary Shumaker

Walter Knapp

Jeff Ruppert

The following people addressed the PC in opposition to the project:

Gordon Forbes

Laurie Moon, Veronica Springs Neighborhood Association

Naomi Kovacs, Citizens Planning Association

Eddie Harris, Santa Barbara Urban Creeks Council

Brian Trautwein, SCWA

The following people spoke to the PC expressing their concerns:

Lee Moldaver

Betty Shumaker

Public Hearing was closed.

Jeff Gorrell, Architect, responded to comments from the public regarding zoned open space, location of area bus stops, and stated the tributary from Campanil Hill will not be piped.

Chip Wullbrandt, Attorney for the applicant, addressed the Commission regarding the Coastal Zone boundary line and various comments from the public.

During the discussion, the Commissioners either individually or collectively:

1. Commissioner White stated that about 10 units are proposed to be built in the area zoned for 20 acres per dwelling unit. The question is, how do you put a viable project on this land? He would have a hard time changing the zoning in the RR-20 portion. We would be adding this property to the City. He does not want to hurt the City's resource base by annexing this open space and converting it to suburban use. With respect to the EIR, he feels that traffic has a much more adverse impact. The City has only made overriding considerations in a few instances (i.e., Fess Parker, maybe Paseo Nuevo, and Cottage Hospital), and does not feel this project meets this consideration. Expressed preference for a six unit project on the site because it would provide a cul-de-sac for Allen Road; would provide for the initial value, and some return for the developer. In conclusion, that becomes a defensible solution for this site. Feels up-zoning and traffic impacts would be bad for the City. While the efforts to restore the creek are laudable, the houses built too close to the creek are a problem. Feels there is no resolution to the Las Positas Road/101 problem, and, in addition, there is a safety issue regarding traffic.
2. Commissioner Mahan feels there is a lot to be said of the experience one has while traveling through the Las Positas Valley, and that it would continue even with the development as proposed. He feels that houses behind this greenbelt will not intrude on the view. The project will ensure 1800 feet of the health of this creek and involve a first class restoration effort. He feels the creek will not be ruined, and would like to approve this big project and get the creek done right as opposed to a small project and not get it done correctly. He is committed to Alan Road being closed, and feels the bridge will be an asset as a pedestrian connection. He stated a lot of money will have to be put into the roundabout, which will help mitigate traffic problems, and feels a big project is necessary to do the slope stabilization. He likes decentralizing the drainage and feels setbacks are reasonable with the 100 foot setback. If the road penetrates into it a little bit, he does not see a problem. He stated he is supportive of this project, and feels the project will fly with some adjustments if necessary.
3. Commissioner Myers agrees with Commissioner Mahan's comments, and most importantly, with respect to creek setbacks. He thanked the applicant for providing what was asked of them. He feels that the bridge and lights will help slow down traffic on Las Positas Road, and that this is a good step in the right direction and would like to see more happen, i.e., posting new speed limits. He does not feel that noise is a big issue, because at the present there is not a serene presence because of the noise coming from below the hill with motor bikes and feels construction noise will be minimal. Commissioner Myers supports the closure of Alan Road, supports this project and feels it will be nice, and the benefits of the project will be good for the community.

4. Commissioner Jacobs feels that a lot of time has been spent looking at the creek and the creek restoration and she would like to look at the valley. She noted the General Plan does not recognize the Las Positas Valley as a neighborhood. She feels that there is some recognition in the General Plan that dense development in this part of the City is not acceptable. She noted it is a very difficult area to develop because it is in a derelict state, and has geologic problems. Commissioner Jacobs feels the developer is giving the property the attention it deserves. She is in favor of something gentle and not intense; supports the residential estates option because the current project would be noticeable from the street, and is not in favor of the bridge. Possibly a lightweight, wooden bridge for bikes and pedestrians, following the footpath to the park would be acceptable. She feels ten or twelve houses seem reasonable. Lastly, considering the balancing act between benefits and the negatives of the project; she wonders why affordable housing has not been proposed for this project.
5. Commissioner Larson stated that she hates arundo, and feels it has no place in any creek. She noted there is a lot of it along Las Positas Road, and it should all be taken away. She thinks of this project in terms of how to get fewer cars on Las Positas, and the best way is creating a pedestrian and bicycle corridor there. She feels they have to think about the roundabout and pedestrian routing and how it will interact. She supports the closure of Alan Road. As for setbacks, she is concerned about the creek, but feels a need to be aware of the whole impact of the auto on the creek. She is in favor of a greater setback, maybe not 100 feet, but 75 feet, which is what Mr. Lee is proposing anyway and would like to see permeable paving and minimal hardscape footprints. She would like to see fewer houses; and is happy to not see a gated community.
6. Chair Maguire agrees with Commissioner Mahan. He feels there are serious traffic problems around the area of Las Positas Road and Hwy 101. He feels it is a cumulative traffic impact, and a tricky problem. The City is in the first stages of addressing that and projects like these contribute to the solution, and every effort to speed the traffic solutions along should be made. This is a project paying a disproportionate amount of money for a traffic mitigation fee for its size and will be contributing to an intersection that is the result of a larger problem. He feels he cannot support this project without a bridge and is in favor of a cul-de-sac at Alan Road. He would like to take advantage of this connection; it rises to a very high level in that you can walk on one bridge and connect with two neighborhoods. He is supportive of this project and feels as a Commissioner this gives him an opportunity to incorporate people into the creeks, as he does not feel that keeping people from the creeks in Santa Barbara is why people voted for Measure B.
7. Commissioner White had forgotten in his comments that he would like to see the cross sections and technical work that goes into determining the top of bank and proposed setbacks. He noted that the 316 West Ortega Street project had the best graphics in that regard and would like to have that provided to the Commission as this project goes forward.
8. Chair Maguire agreed and also requested a copy of the presentation made by the applicant.

Ms. Hubbell answered some of the Commission's questions.

Mr. Lee thanked the Commission for all of their comments and input, and stated he feels they received great input.



**IX. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA**

A. Committee and Liaison Reports.

None were given.

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

None were requested.

**X. ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Maguire adjourned the meeting at 10:30 p.m.

Submitted by,

---

Deana Rae McMillion, Admin/Clerical Supervisor for Liz N. Ruiz, Senior Recording Secretary