



# City of Santa Barbara Planning Division

## PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

June 2, 2005

### **CALL TO ORDER:**

Chair Jonathan Maguire called the meeting to order at 1:02 p.m.

### **ROLL CALL:**

#### **Present:**

Vice-Chair John Jostes

Commissioners, Charmaine Jacobs, Bill Mahan, and Harwood A. White, Jr.

Chair Jonathan Maguire

#### **Absent:**

Commissioners' Stella Larson and George Myers

### **PARK AND RECREATION COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:**

Ada Conner, Park and Recreation Commissioner

Arnoldo Gonzalez, Parks and Recreation Commissioner

Margaret L. Niehaus, Park and Recreation Commissioner

### **CREEKS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

M. Michael Hackett, Creeks Advisory Commissioner

Beebe Longstreet, Park and Recreation Commissioner

David A. Pritchett, Creeks Advisory Commissioner

### **STAFF PRESENT:**

Bettie Weiss, City Planner

Kathleen Kennedy, Assistant Planner

Renee Brooke, Assistant Planner

Susan Reardon, Project Planner

Debra Andaloro, Project Planner

John Ledbetter, Principal Planner

Nancy Rapp, Park & Recreation Director

N. Scott Vincent, Assistant City Attorney

Liz N. Ruiz, Planning Commission Secretary

**II. PRELIMINARY MATTERS:**

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

Ms. Weiss announced there were none.

B. Announcements and appeals.

Ms. Weiss informed the Planning Commission that an appeal has been filed for 737 E. Anapamu.

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

There were none.

**III. CONSENT ITEMS:**

**ACTUAL TIME: 1:04 P.M.**

**A. APPLICATION OF SOUTER LAND USE CONSULTING, AGENT FOR PROPERTY OWNERS, BEVERLY WEST DOULTON, 3 SOLANA COURT, APN 047-071-012, AND STEPHEN D. AND MARIA ROWBOTTAM, 447 ALAN ROAD, APN 047-071-013, E-3/SD-3: ONE-FAMILY RESIDENCE AND COASTAL OVERLAY ZONES, GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: RESIDENTIAL, ONE UNIT/ACRE (MST2004-00117)**

The project consists of a Lot Line Adjustment between Parcel 1 (3 Solana Court, APN 047-071-012) and Parcel 2 (447 Alan Road, APN 047-071-013). No new development is proposed.

The discretionary applications required for this project are:

1. Modification to allow Parcel 1 (3 Solana Court, APN 047-071-012) to have less than the required lot area in the E-3 Zone (SBMC§28.15.080);
2. Modification to allow Parcel 2 (447 Alan Road, APN 047-071-013) to have less than the required lot area in the E-3 Zone (SBMC§28.15.080);
3. Modification to allow a fence on Parcel 2 to exceed three and one-half feet (3-1/2') within ten feet (10') of the front lot line (SBMC§28.87.170); and
4. Lot Line Adjustment (LLA) to change the property line between Parcel 1 (3 Solana Court, APN 047-071-012) and Parcel 2 (447 Alan Road, APN 047-071-013) (Gov. Code §66412).

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

**MOTION: White/Jostes**

To waive the presentation of the staff report.

This motion carried by the following vote:

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

With no one wishing to speak, the public hearing was opened and closed at 1:05 p.m.

Commissioners' comments and questions:

1. Asked if the over height fence is illegal and if the normal procedure would have been for the owner to request a modification. It would have been the prerogative of the Modification Hearing Officer to look at the design of the fence, and suggest that the Architectural Board of Review look at it.
2. Stated no problem with the lot line adjustment; however, the fence is too tall and was installed illegally. Understand that a fence protecting the swimming pool has to be five feet on the outside, and that would be reasonable modification. Stated that the tall fence along side the house is not reasonable based on the justification that it provides privacy. Commented that the ABR could review the fence and find a solution that is acceptable i.e., if the fence were set back one foot or more, it could be planted on the outside. Stated support for a motion that includes taking the fence to the ABR.
3. Asked staff, now that the City is aware of an illegal fence, whether this is an enforcement case.
4. Stated that if the fence modification is not approved, it becomes an enforcement issue. If the fence modification is part of the lot line adjustment, then there leverage to have the fence reduced before the lot split is recorded.

Syndi Souter, Agent for the applicant, stated that the question posed to her by Commissioner Mahan is something the property owners need to work out between themselves. Ms. Souter also stated she would prefer to finish the item today.

Ms. Weiss spoke as to the applicant's options in that the fence was illegally built.

Mr. Vincent suggested that the lot line adjustment is contingent upon consistency with the Zoning Ordinance and the General Plan. The fence needs to be brought into compliance with the Zoning Ordinance prior to the recordation of the lot line adjustment. There are three options: 1) to reduce the fence to the height consistent with the Zoning Ordinance, with the understanding that this is a problem because of the existence of the pool and the need to comply with the State law regarding height of fence around pools; 2) reduce the height of the fence sufficient to meet the State law, keeping the current material and design, which would require a modification of the Zoning Ordinance standard, or 3) allow a height in excess of what is necessary to meet the State law for the swimming pool and have the fence go to the ABR as a condition of the modification.

**MOTION: Mahan/Jostes**

**Assigned Resolution No. 040-05**

To require the fence adjacent to the house to be no higher than 3 ½ feet so it meets the Zoning Ordinance; grant a modification for that portion of the fence protecting the swimming pool to be five feet, with all fence measurements to be from the sidewalk, which meets the State law requirement, and grant the lot line adjustment.

Syndi Souter, Agent for the applicant, asked for clarification of the motion.

Ms. Weiss noted that this condition requires that the fence be reduced to 3 ½ feet for the length along the house and at the corner of the house a gate shall be installed consistent with State law, and the remaining portion of the fence shall be reduced to a height of five feet.

Commissioner Jacobs asked that it be confirmed that the heights are to be measured from the sidewalk in the motion.

This motion carried by the following vote:

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

Chair Maguire announced the ten calendar day appeal period.

**ACTUAL TIME: 1:26 P.M.**

**B. APPLICATION OF VADIM M. HSU, AGENT FOR MICHAEL STAPULA, JASON THIBODEAU AND CHAD RATLIFF (PROPERTY OWNERS), 624 DEL MONTE AVENUE, APN 037-021-017, R-3/ LIMITED MULTIPLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE ZONE, GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: RESIDENTIAL, 12 UNITS/ACRE (MST2004-00740)**

The project consists of the conversion of an existing 858 square-foot single family residence to a condominium, and the construction of an additional 1,251 square-foot condominium unit above a new two-car garage, on a 5,000 square-foot lot. Two uncovered parking spaces are also proposed as part of the project, for a total of four parking spaces on the site. An existing 220 square-foot one-car garage and a large avocado tree at the rear of the property would be removed. The discretionary applications required for this project are:

1. A Tentative Subdivision Map for a one-lot subdivision to create two (2) residential condominium units (SBMC§27.07 and 27.13);
2. A Modification to allow an uncovered parking space to encroach into the required interior yard (SBMC §28.92.026.A.2); and
3. A Modification to allow an uncovered parking space to encroach into the required rear yard (SBMC §28.92.026.A.2).

The Environmental Analyst has determined that the project is exempt from further environmental review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Guidelines Sections 15303 (New Construction), 15315 (Minor Land Divisions), and 15301 (Existing Facilities).

**MOTION: Mahan/Jostes**

To waive the presentation of the staff report.

This motion carried by the following vote:

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

Vadim Hsu, Agent and Architect for the applicant, briefly updated the commission on the story poles presented in this project.

With no one wishing to speak, the public hearing was opened and closed at 1:27 p.m.

Commissioners' comments and questions:

1. Stated this is a very nice infill project and the modification can be supported as presented.
2. Stated the gate appears to define an entrance to the unit at the rear. In reviewing the plans, there is no differentiated pavement, or designation of a pedestrian connection from the front door to the street.
3. Commented that consent items are now like test cases since they will be going to the Staff Hearing Officer in the future. One of the items they recommended regarding the Staff Hearing Officer ordinance is to delineate a pedestrian path, separate from the driveway, from each unit to the sidewalk on projects of 2-4 units. He is concerned because this is not provided on this particular project and it is one that would go to the Staff Hearing Officer. He would like to see that a condition of approval be added for a delineated pedestrian path.
4. He thinks the ribbon driveway should be some kind of enhanced pavement and should continue and tie into the arbor gate at the rear of the site. The pathway is an important thing, as it is a pedestrian area as well as a backup area, and is sure the Architectural Board of Review can work out the details.

Mr. Hsu answered Chair Maguire's question regarding the gate.

**MOTION: White/Jacobs**

**Assigned Resolution No. 041-05**

To approve the tentative subdivision map and the two modifications as outlined in the staff report and that the conditions be amended to include differentiated pavement extending to the entrance of the rear unit.

This motion carried by the following vote:

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

Chair Maguire announced the ten calendar day appeal period.

**IV. NEW ITEMS**

**ACTUAL TIME: 1:33 P.M.**

**A. APPLICATION OF JAN HOCHHAUSER, HOCHHAUSER BLATTER ARCHITECTS, AGENT FOR PROPERTY OWNERS, JOE W. BUTLER II AND PAMELA J. QUIRKE, TRUSTEES, 508 E. DE LA GUERRA STREET, APN 031-101-018 AND 514 E. DE LA GUERRA STREET, APN 031-101-019, R-3: LIMITED MULTIPLE-FAMILY**

**RESIDENCE ZONE, GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: RESIDENTIAL, TWELVE UNITS/ACRE (MST2004-00233)**

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

The discretionary applications required for this project are:

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

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

Kathleen Kennedy, Assistant Planner, gave a brief overview of the project

Jan Hochhauser, Agent and Architect for the applicant, gave a brief presentation.

Commissioners' comments and questions:

1. Asked applicant since he is already providing pervious surfaces around the Oak tree, if he would be amenable to expanding those pervious surfaces to some of the driveway areas. Asked if he feels he has adequately screened the trash recycling areas from view along De la Guerra and Olive Streets.
2. Asked staff about the lot line adjustment and how it fits into City policy regarding this zone; what would it take to get a lot split, and what the minimum lot size is for creating a new parcel in this zone. Asked if any more bedrooms and/or units can be added to this project.
3. Commented to staff that there are no story poles in this project; for others there have been, so asked what are the rules. Said he recognizes that story poles are an announcement to the neighborhood, and the neighbors have a right to the story poles and feels a project of this size should require story poles as part of the procedure, and would like to see them in the future.

4. Asked of applicant; where the pedestrian connection is to the back unit.
5. In referring to the ABR minutes there was an ongoing discussion of front porch on the De la Guerra street side for Building B. The ABR is calling for a more expansive front porch, which would be consistent with the craftsman's style. Asked what is the progress on meeting the ABR's comment and if they have seen the current iteration.
6. Asked applicant about the stairway up to unit in Building A, and why does it not just come to the street.
7. Stated support for this project. Feels it has a nice mix of bedroom sizes, and doesn't max out the site. Has a rental unit which is a significant benefit to this project and has very nice architecture and is fully supportive of it, but would like to see an increase in some of those pervious surfaces.
8. Thanked applicant for bringing both parcels to their attention. Missed story poles, happy to see this variety of housing in the R-3 zone, the reduced curb cuts, and the overall good arrangement on the site. Likes the open space on unit A, which gives breathing room to the bungalow next door to it. Overall, the site arrangement is very good even though there is a 50% increase over what would normally be on this relatively small lot. Will look to support a motion in favor of this; not entirely happy with porch on unit B; thinks it is being recessed and takes something away from streetscape. Finally, in the conditions of approval, there are bus stop improvements and is glad to see that, and hopes it is a nice deluxe one with a bench and trash can.
9. Agrees with fellow commissioners' comments. Roof terrace is properly located in a way that will not in any way be objectionable to the surrounding neighbors, and appreciates the smaller one also.
10. Expressed concern that they are reducing the lot width to below 50 feet, which is something they have looked at and drawn the line on in other situations feeling 50 feet is a minimum width for a good development. What they have done here to make it successful is provide the shared access along the corridor, and it allows the thinner lot to work. Feels the shared access between the two lots is a real improvement to land use over what they customarily see.
11. Asked if it would be a street frontage waiver.

With no one wishing to speak, the public hearing was opened and closed at 2:00 p.m.

Ms. Weiss clarified the number of bedrooms/units allowed for this project. She also stated that an issue was discovered regarding compliance with the Zoning Ordinance that was not identified in the staff report. Lot 2, the smaller rental lot, is currently nonconforming to both frontage and size. The minimum frontage requirement is 60 feet and the lot area minimum is 14,000 square feet. The street frontage is being reduced further and that would require a modification approval. Therefore, the project is not ready for action in terms of compliance with the Zoning Ordinance without proper consideration of the modification. Staff needs to change their recommendation to be a continuance rather than an action today so they can properly notice all the issues involved in the project.

Mr. Vincent stated the way the City has been approaching lot lines adjustments; subdivisions in general, has been looking at consistency with the Zoning Ordinance. This creates the consistency

needed for the zoning approval of the subdivision and lot line adjustment. They do work together in that sense; the lot line adjustment is dependent upon the finding of the modifications.

**MOTION: Jostes/White**

Move to continue.

Comments to the motion:

Commissioner Jacobs asked if they want to see story poles; do they feel story poles would be useful to the neighborhood and the public in the next discussion or not.

Commissioner Maguire stated he is very much in support of the project. He thinks the affordable by design aspects of this project are quite remarkable. There are a couple of rental units associated so it is a very good project. He is sorry it has to be continued, but hopefully it will be back soon.

Commissioner White asked of Staff, where is the nearest set of kiddie swings to this property? He would appreciate hearing that.

Commissioner Mahan asked staff, can they approve all the other aspects of this project and continue it to the Modification Hearing Officer with recommendations? Also, feels that a project this size should have story poles and believes it is only fair to the neighborhood that they see those and if this item is to be continued as he feels it is a good opportunity to correct that oversight.

Ms. Weiss stated that since the modifications are directly related to the subdivision, it is necessary that all modifications of the code be shown on the subdivision map and considered at the same time.

This motion carried by the following vote:

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

Recessed at 2:15 p.m., and reconvened at 2:32 p.m.

**ACTUAL TIME: 2:32 P.M.**

**B. APPLICATION OF JON DOHM (SUZANNE ELLEDGE PLANNING & PERMITTING SERVICES), AGENT FOR WILLIAM D. WRIGHT (PROPERTY OWNER), CABRILLO PLAZA SPECIFIC PLAN #2, APNS 017-630-005, -009, -013, -014, -018, -021, -022, -028, HRC-2/HOTEL-RELATED COMMERCE, M-1/LIGHT MANUFACTURING, OM-1/OCEAN-ORIENTED LIGHT MANUFACTURING, SP-2/SPECIFIC PLAN, AND SD-3/COASTAL OVERLAY ZONES, GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATIONS: HOTEL & RELATED COMMERCE, RESIDENTIAL, 12 UNITS PER ACRE, INDUSTRIAL, AND BUFFER/STREAM (MST2004-00134) (CDP2004-00012).**

The proposal involves the initiation of an Amendment to the Zoning Ordinance, specifically Santa Barbara Municipal Code §28.87.300.B. (Development Plan Review and Approval), to re-classify the Cabrillo Plaza Project Specific Plan as an “Approved Project” rather than a “Pending



Project” for Measure E (Charter Section 1508) purposes. At this time, the discretionary application required for this request is an Initiation of a Zoning Ordinance Amendment.

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

Jonathan Dohm, Agent, addressed the Planning Commission.

Dave Davis, Agent, addressed why they filed for an amendment.

With no one wishing to speak, the public hearing was opened and closed at 2:43 p.m.

Commissioners’ comments and questions:

1. Asked staff the reason for this amendment.
2. Commented there is a fascinating history to this project, and feels the Specific Plan and the public improvements that pre-mitigate the traffic impacts of future development really goes to the heart of what the Specific Plan was all about. As far as background traffic growth goes, this applicant has paid their fare share.
3. Asked staff if the environmental review of the zoning ordinance request change is folded into the application package coming through the process, or is it done separately?
4. Commented that all of the properties that have been identified already have existing commercial uses on them. Asked if in environmental review would the document be looking at the allowed traffic generation for the commercial site?

Ms. Weiss stated that Staff would establish a baseline for traffic in the environmental setting of the review.

Mr. Davis once again addressed the Planning Commission regarding the proposed change in the ordinance as it relates to Measure E.

**MOTION: White/Mahan**

**Assigned Resolution No. 042-05**

To initiate the zoning ordinance amendment to reclassify the Cabrillo Plaza Specific Plan as an Approved Project.

This motion carried by the following vote:

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

Bill Wright thanked the Planning Commission for their consideration.

Recessed at 2:56 p.m., and reconvened at 3:31 p.m.

**V. DISCUSSION ITEM: (CONTINUED FROM MAY 5, 2005)**

**ACTUAL TIME: 3:31 P.M.**

**JOINT MEETING WITH PARK AND RECREATION COMMISSION REGARDING  
GENERAL PLAN UPDATE 2030 – CONDITIONS, TRENDS, AND ISSUES REPORTS:  
PARKS AND RECREATIONAL FACILITIES, CREEKS AND STORM DRAIN SYSTEM  
(MST 2005-00002)**

Planning and Park and Recreation Department staff will present the Conditions, Trends, and Issues Reports for Parks and Recreational Facilities and Creeks and Storm Drain System. These Conditions, Trends, and Issues Reports are the fifth in a series of baseline reports that are being prepared during Phase I of the General Plan Update (GPU) 2030 process. The Planning Commission, Park and Recreation Commission, and members of the Creeks Advisory Committee will be asked to review and comment on these reports.

Case Planners: Susan Reardon, Project Planner, Debra Andaloro, Project Planner, and John Ledbetter, Principal Planner

Email: sreardon@SantaBarbara.Ca.gov

dandaloro@SantaBarbara.CA.gov

jledbetter@SantaBarbara.CA.gov

John Ledbetter, Principal Planner, briefly addressed the Planning Commission, Park and Recreation Commission, and the Creeks Advisory Committee.

**Parks and Recreation:**

Susan Reardon, Project Planner, presented the Parks and Recreation Conditions, Trends & Issues Report, outlining previous studies, summary of current parkland need as well as future need; trends; and issues.

With no one wishing to speak, the public hearing was opened and closed at 3:51 p.m.

Parks and Recreation Commissioners' comments and questions:

1. Suggested adding zoning designations to the Park Service Area Maps.
2. Suggested Identification of existing Park and Recreation Advisory Committees and their functions.
3. Stated a need to further analyze changing demographics
4. Stated multi-use/shared use of parks gets more use out of parks (Examples include exercise equipment in parks, play structure at Municipal Tennis Courts).
5. Stated barrier to access (such as the freeway, lack of sidewalks or street lights, topography) creates impediments to park use.
6. Stated that land banking for new or expanded parks is a huge opportunity that should be taken advantage of.
7. Recognized it is hard to change park use/zone because of neighborhood interests.

Commissioners' comments:

1. Stated changing land use density in the downtown area, along transportation corridors, and in other areas affect park use and demand.
2. Commented we're seeing a change in the way parks are used.
3. Commented that today's senior's are more active than in the past.
4. Concerned with the increasing "commercial" activities that have been occurring in City parks.
5. Stated this is an opportunity to create a sense of community stewardship in regards to parks.
6. Stated that analysis of parkland need should be based on density rather than distance.
7. Suggested the need to look at how the park is funded now, who uses them and when, and how park use would change with changing demographics.
8. Suggested careful analysis needs to occur in regards to barriers to accessing neighborhood parks.
9. Stated need for a regional perspective of parks; who uses our parks, and what parks outside of City do City residents use and how they use them.
10. Stated trails are important to connection of open space and parking at trail heads needs to be provided.
11. Suggested looking at all opportunities for funding.
12. Stated pocket parks are important.

Creeks Committee Comments:

1. Suggested that the map showing the circles around the parks could be improved by refining the geographic information system by a process called the query. The census tract data of population should be analyzed in GIS, as well as the zone of influence on human density. Lastly, bio-geographic barriers like the freeway, railroad, and the stream channels should be shown on the map.

Creeks and Storm Drains

Debra Andaloro, Project Planner, gave a brief, yet broad overview, on creeks and the storm drain system.

With no one wishing to speak, the public hearing was opened and closed at 4:41 p.m.

Creeks Advisory Committee members' comments and questions:

- 1 Stated the Creeks Advisory Committee is looking for guidance from members of the Planning and Recreation Commissions. Referred to a memorandum that was handed out and outlined committee members' comments and observations. Also referred to the Creek Restoration and Water Quality Improvement Program Summary Reports (to be distributed).
2. Commented that on August 2001 the Creeks Committee went over their goals about eliminating and reducing pollution and increasing community involvement and restoring the

creeks/stream channels and improve public access. They compared the Creeks Committee goals with the existing Conservation Element of the General Plan. They found that the Conservation Element has very similar language and that it is a very good and progressive document.

3. Thanked staff for their presentation, and stated they would appreciate any suggestions and guidance they might have, in order to report back to the rest of their commission.
4. Sees GPU as a time to start new dialog and sees this as a great opportunity for making communication key and that work can begin on some of these issues.
5. Commented that new policies need to be crafted carefully and contain enough detail so that they are valuable to future decision-makers.
6. Stated that the Federal Endangered Species law was not included in the list of regulations in the CTI Report.
7. Setbacks for creeks need to be functional, and not just an arbitrary distance.

Park and Recreation Commissioners' comments and questions:

1. Stated the GPU process is a great opportunity to open the dialog between the City, the County, and private property owners.
2. Commented that the review of the Veronica Meadows project was torturous and that planning shouldn't occur at the project level.
3. Also important is not to forget about future technology that will clean up the water and restore the creeks and requires some open space to be left open for future technology to be implemented.
4. Stated Mr. Pritchett is very knowledgeable about fish and he is a wonderful resource. Does not want to forget about planning for creating the best habitat to keep whatever can be saved in our creeks.
5. Commented that other cities have done wonderful things with their creeks and look at those examples.
6. Feels the main thrust of Measure B was to have cleaner water so the beaches were less polluted and whatever can be done on a planning level to keep getting the water cleaner should be done to honor the intent of this measure.

Planning Commissioners' comments and questions:

1. Commented about the conflict between urbanization and drainages, and the need to give smaller drainages credence and not allow further undergrounding.
2. Commented that one of the statistics that stood out was the amount of pipe (47.7 miles) in the City of Santa Barbara.
3. Referred to a project in the Las Positas area and that a creek specialist gave a good presentation on creek restoration, and what creeks should really be, and how wonderful they are when they are restored properly.
4. Commented that the GPU should include some really strong language to lead future planners, City Council, etc. in the right directions as existing policies are not strong enough.
5. Stated desire to see maps that identify the areas where we can realistically make some impacts on creek restoration, like the Veronica Meadows project.

6. Commented on enforcing erosion control, and supervising the grading that is going on.
7. Asked who maintains the storm drain system?
8. Feels we should have the same level of information in regards to storm drainage as we do for the sewage system.
9. Stated one of the ways the Planning Commission is able to implement the policies that the City has is through its' standard conditions of approval.
10. Feels the creeks in the City need to be people friendly and likes the comment of orienting development towards the creeks.
11. Commented that creeks can't be restored to pre-historic condition and that the creeks have to be addressed in an urban context.
12. Suggested they get recommendations on standard conditions of approval related to creeks from the Creeks Committee.
13. Praised Measure B funds and thanked the members of the community that worked to make this possible.
14. Commented about conflict between urbanization and creeks restoration, and desire to see some guidelines that would make possible the two things valued in our urban creeks. One being clean water and the other gentle pathways that allow people to: see the creeks; walk beside them; view them; and, enjoy them.
15. Commented on the watershed action plans, in particular the Arroyo Burro plan. Commented that these action plans are great tools that can give us at least four useful things: 1) action plans allow for education as they are well worded and well produced 2) help in the need for greater coordination between various bodies such as Parks and Recreation, Public Works, and Community Development 3) start to provide some of the needed data on the sources of pollution, and to point to the need to continue to collect that data; (e.g. is the pollution coming from septic tanks, is it coming from livestock, is it coming from cars run off, where is it coming from?). Feels this is important in the planning process, and 4) that these watershed specific action plans can provide direction for the GPU and policy guidance.
16. Commented on detention and retention and stated there should be a check list item that is looked at every time a development comes in to ensure no net increase in run-off post-development.
17. Stated support for a comprehensive drainage system plan.
18. Commented that the Creeks and Storm Drain System CTI Report is very good.
19. Commented that creeks need to be integrated into more than just planning.
20. Commented that there is a need for certainty about what matters and then we need to address how to get there with clear, articulate standards that will guide us years into the future.
21. Stated that the visioning process for the GPU is where the Creeks Advisory Committee can be involved.
22. Stated the importance of looking for the connecting pieces that addresses carrying capacity between all seven CTI reports and how to make the report findings useful to the general public.
15. Stated that the handout received from the Creeks Advisory Committee's work session is required reading for all Planning Commissioners. Feels there is opportunity to make and

implement policy and create a new vision with interfacing with the Creeks Advisory Committee on the new GPU.

Mr. Ledbetter asked the Creeks Advisory Committee to be patient with staff as in the next few months they will be working with a consultant who will be putting together workshops for public input, etc. Comments received today will be incorporated into the next report.

Nancy Rapp, Recreation Director, said they do need more information from other entities in regard to storm drainage. She stated it was very nice to hear intuitive comments from the Planning Commission and comments in regards to community needs.

## **VI. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA**

### **A. Committee and Liaison Reports.**

Chair Maguire reported on the Ordinance Committee meeting for the Staff Hearing Officer.

Ms. Weiss reported that City Staff is undertaking an examination of the Planning Commission staff reports and extended an invitation for them to attend.

Commissioner White reported on the Chanlory Building at the harbor.

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

None.

### **C. Action on the review and consideration of the items listed in I.B.2. of this Agenda.**

**MOTION: Mahan/Jacobs** To approve the minutes and resolutions as corrected.

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

## **VII. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:39 p.m.

Submitted by,

---

Deana Rae McMillion, Admin/Clerical Supervisor for Liz N. Ruiz, Planning Commission Secretary