



City of Santa Barbara Planning Division

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

OCTOBER 20, 2005

CALL TO ORDER:

The meeting was called to order at 1:06 P.M.

ROLL CALL:

Present:

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

Absent:

Chair Jonathan Maguire
Vice-Chair John Jostes

STAFF PRESENT:

Jan Hubbell, Senior Planner
Trish Allen, Associate Planner
Steven Faulstich, Housing Programs Supervisor
Michael Berman, Project Planner
Kathleen Kennedy, Assistant Planner
Roxanne Milazzo, Associate Planner
N. Scott Vincent, Assistant City Attorney
Deborah J. Bush, Recording Secretary
Sherrell Bortman, Planning Commission Secretary

II. PRELIMINARY MATTERS:

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

None.

B. Announcements and appeals.

Ms. Hubbell announced that on November 15, 2005, there will be an appeal to City Council regarding 1905 Cliff Drive. Commissioner Mahan volunteered to attend.

The appeal of the denial of initiation of the rezone and local coastal plan amendment for Alan and Wade Court will be heard on December 13, 2005.

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

Public Comment opened at 1:07 P.M.

Kathy Gebhardt, Citizens Planning Association, stated her concerns on outer State Street projects.

Dianne Channing commented on a need for a comprehensive general plan for outer State Street.

Public comment was closed at 1:12 P.M.

Commissioner White arrived at 1:12 P.M.

III. NEW ITEMS

ACTUAL TIME: 1:12 P.M.

A. APPEAL OF A MODIFICATION DENIAL OF AN APPLICATION OF RON SORGMAN, AGENT FOR JOSEPH & ELAINE WEBSTER, 2435 CALLE LINARES, APN 041-411-010, E-1 ONE-FAMILY RESIDENCE ZONE, GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: RESIDENTIAL 3 UNITS PER ACRE (MST2005-00365)

The project consists of a 116 square-foot second-story addition and 45 square-foot deck to an existing 2,840 square foot residence with attached two-car garage. A Modification Hearing was held on August 10, 2005. The Modification Hearing Officer was unable to make the required findings and the project was denied. This is an appeal of that decision.

The discretionary application required for this project is a Modification to permit additions within the required ten-foot (10') interior yard setback (SBMC §28.15.060). The Environmental Analyst has determined that the project is exempt from further environmental review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Guidelines Section 15305 (ENV2005-00365).

Case Planner: Roxanne Milazzo, Assistant Planner

Email: RMilazzo@SantaBarbaraCA.gov

Ms. Milazzo gave a brief overview of the project.

Commissioners' questions and comments:

Commissioner Myers asked about the expansion of the footprint by the added deck.

Ms. Hubbell answered that the deck was not part of the house footprint.

Ron Sorgman, Architect on the project, gave a brief presentation of the project.

Public comment opened at 1:21 P.M. and the following people spoke in favor of the project:

Siobhan Thames
Steven M. Little

With no one else wishing to speak the public hearing was closed at 1:26 P.M.

Commissioners' questions and comments:

1. Support Modification given that neighbor's house has no openings along the project side and property's steep slopes make it difficult to do additions elsewhere.
2. Modification is also acceptable based on pattern of development in neighborhood, but would like to see landscaping added on the downhill side of the building to reduce its visual impacts.
3. Noted that, when a porch is enclosed as part of the house, noise and privacy will actually be improved for the neighbor.

Mr. Sorgman agreed to provide additional landscaping

MOTION: Jacobs/Myers

Assigned Resolution No. 064-05

Uphold the appeal and grant a modification for this project with the condition that the property below the understory on the downhill side will be landscaped, as approved by the ABR, finding that the Modification results in an appropriate improvement because it is consistent with the pattern of development in the neighborhood, the neighboring house does not have any openings on the project side, the addition is mostly under the existing roof, additions elsewhere on the parcel are difficult due to the steep slope, and when the porch is enclosed, noise and privacy will be improved for the neighbor.

This motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 5 Noes: 0 Abstain: 0 Absent: 2

Commissioner Mahan announced the ten calendar day appeal period.

The Commission recessed from 1:50 P.M. to 2:15 P.M.

ACTUAL TIME: 2:12 P.M.

B. APPLICATION OF B3 ARCHITECTS, AGENT FOR CLEO M. PURDY AND MICHAEL G. SCHMIDTCHEN, CO-TRUSTEES, PROPERTY OWNERS, 3885 AND 3887 STATE STREET, APN 051-022-012 AND 051-022-033, C-2/SD-2: COMMERCIAL AND UPPER STATE STREET AREA ZONES, GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: GENERAL COMMERCE (MST2004-00801)

The project consists of a merger of two parcels and the construction of a new mixed-use development with three commercial spaces (9,049 sq. ft. total) and fifty-five (55) one-bedroom

condominium units. The residential condominium units consist of 38 market rate units, 15 middle income affordable units and 2 moderate income affordable units. The proposal includes 99 parking spaces (84 spaces in a subterranean garage and 15 uncovered spaces). The existing 12 room motel and the 22,250 square foot office building would be demolished.

The discretionary applications required for this project are:

1. Modification to allow encroachments into the front yard setback along State Street (SBMC§28.45.008);
2. Modification of lot area requirements to allow twenty-one (21) bonus density residential condominium units (SBMC§28.21.080.G);
3. Modification to allow less than the required number of parking spaces (SBMC§28.90.100); and
4. Tentative Subdivision Map for a one-lot subdivision to create fifty-five (55) residential condominium units and three (3) commercial condominium units (SBMC§27.07 and 27.13).

The Environmental Analyst has determined that the project is exempt from further environmental review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15332 (Proposed Infill Development Project).

Case Planner: Kathleen Kennedy, Assistant Planner

Email: kkennedy@SantaBarbaraCA.gov

Kathleen Kennedy, Assistant Planner, made a brief presentation. Ms. Kennedy stated she had received 21 letters and emails and 4 voicemail messages expressing concern for this project and general development concerns for outer State Street development.

Ms. Hubbell stated that Mr. Scott A. Schell, Traffic Engineer for the applicant, would be making a presentation; however City Transportation Staff was out ill and unable to make a presentation.

Mr. Barry Berkus, of B3 Architects, gave a brief presentation of the project and emphasized that all profits generated from this project will go to charity. The affordable units will not cost the City any money.

Mr. Schell gave a brief presentation.

John Rosenfeld, B3 Architects, gave a brief presentation.

The public hearing was opened at 2:43 P.M.

The following people spoke in opposition to the project.

Paul Hernadi, Citizens Planning Association
Kathy Gebhardt, Citizens Planning Association
Jim Kahan, Allied Neighbors Association
Joe Guzzardi

The following person asked a question about the project:

Juan Ramirez

The following people spoke in support of the project:

Steve Cushman, Santa Barbara Region Chamber of Commerce.

Bud Laurant, Coastal Housing Partnership

Dane Goodman

Patricia Hiles

Earl Ensberg

With no one else wishing to speak, the public comment was closed at 3:07 P.M.

Commissioners' questions and comments:

1. Asked about affordable housing and what became of the idea proposed by the applicant for the City to assist with down payments for buyers purchasing affordable housing units; asked for ball park figure of unit cost and down payment necessary for purchase.
2. Asked if the Housing Authority would take over and administer this project.
3. Asked about the length of time that the project will remain in the affordable housing inventory.
4. Asked if there are four bonus density units that will be market rate.
5. Asked about the plate heights of the commercial component vs. residential component.
6. Asked about relocation program for the residents of the motel.
7. Asked whether the live/work area involved in each unit changes the parking requirements or any other requirements.
8. Asked how much of the land on parcel is proposed to be landscaped.
9. Asked where nearest park resources are for proposed project.
10. Asked about traffic generation for proposed commercial space.
11. Asked about the subterranean garage fitting the footprint of the building and wondered if any consideration was given to exceeding the footprint and going into the driveway.
12. Asked for clarification of assumptions and methodology in traffic and parking analysis. Asked about live and work at home scenarios, such as therapist vs. artist; how is it determined who will live there and traffic generated.
13. Asked for definition of "small family".
14. Asked if heights have been reduced to eliminate the basement as a story.
15. Asked if parking in parking structure would be open parking or designated parking.
16. Asked what the rent amount is when looking at 3 month rent abatement for existing tenants.
17. Asked for definition of "infill", since infill is exempt from environmental review; suggested inclusion in future staff reports.
18. Asked about the General Plan in relation to project development on outer State Street. Read that outer State Street would not have residential.
19. Would like to have seen a staff analysis of the SD-2 requirement re: 2-story and 3-story.

20. Asked how staff evaluates cumulative impacts of traffic and noise when recognizing that there are other projects being proposed for upper State Street.
21. Would like to have seen staff analysis include scenario matrixes on how bonus density was determined.
22. Asked if any consideration was given to solar aspects for the building.
23. Supports an urban village, but is concerned with design guidelines being kept for Upper State Street and the setbacks of adjacent buildings should be considered more than what has been presented.
24. Supports developing guidelines for upper State Street. Supports developing a focused program EIR to look at traffic on upper State Street, given that there are multiple projects in the pipeline.
25. Feels that Zoning Ordinance numbers should be used, not what is reflected in parking analysis given that present use is a disabled low-rent housing area and not a motel.
26. Supports mixed use, but density is too great; zoning density suggests 34 units, but the applicant is proposing 55 units. Perhaps somewhere in the middle would be just right.
27. Concerned with project coming in with a bold statement and no environmental review.
28. Would like to see the access driveway become a like a Paseo. Three commissioners expressed concerns with setbacks, access, and with density.
29. Concerned with vertical mass imposing on street.
30. Would like to see a full environmental impact report (EIR).
31. Feels that greater accessibility and diversity should be included in the project.
32. Would like to see SD-2 setbacks maintained.
33. Project should have come in for a Concept Review. With the many projects coming up, it's wise to go slower. Concerned that parking will not meet zoning requirements. ITE traffic analysis doesn't work right here. Not comfortable with size, bulk and scale.
34. Not prepared to cut a deal and cut off 20 feet. Too square, needs to be softened, balconies opened up; rear elevation the same. West elevation is more successful than the East elevation. Wants to continue the project for a redesign.

Steven Faulstich, Housing and Programs Supervisor, replied that under the City's sources of funding for affordable housing, available funds are limited to low and moderate income housing. It is possible for down payment assistance to be provided for the two proposed affordable moderate income housing units; however, this is a low priority for the City given the number of potential buyers that would be using savings and other down payment sources. In terms of pricing, the 15 middle income units would sell for \$219,400 and the 2 moderate income units will be priced at \$175,700. He suggests that these affordability conditions be amended to include these prices since they would be set at the date of the final Planning Commission approval and not at the time of marketing of the project.

Mr. Faulstich made the distinction that the Housing Authority is limited to administering low income rental projects; The City's Affordable Housing Programs office will be involved in qualifying buyers, approving the marketing plan, assisting with the lottery, and subsequent sales from original owners when they go to sell. He further stated that the affordable housing units will be inventory for a rolling 45 year period, with up to 90 years maximum.

Mr. Faulstich stated that there are 21 density bonus units, of which 17 are affordable. The below market benefit is greater than if the City's density bonus requirement was followed. This is the difference between the market value of the units and what they could be sold for without restrictions vs. with restrictions resulting in the below market benefit. When a larger number of bonus density units are proposed rather than required, market rate units can be included to offset the lost market value.

Mr. Berkus confirmed that the 10 foot plate heights are the same for commercial as residential. Parking will be designated for residential, but separated parking for commercial will be open.

Mr. Rosenfeld stated that there are 12 existing rooms on the motel site and the applicant is working with City staff to address relocation issue. Ms. Hubbell added that the City presently does not have a program for relocation in this particular type of situation. Mr. Rosenfeld suggested supplying the residents with 3 month's rent as a solution.

Ms. Hubbell stated that density is being based by number of bedrooms per unit; however, the units are designed as one room without separation of space within units, hence no parking or density issues are involved. Circulation and housing elements encourage mixed use developments.

Mr. Berkus replied that 28% of the project area is open space and planters will be built on top of decks to provide green space. Derrick Eichelberger, landscape architect, pointed out the landscaped areas.

Ms. Hubbell stated that Willow Glen Park was nearby in the Grove Lane neighborhood, behind Monte Vista Elementary School on Hope Avenue.

Mr. Schell replied that the traffic analysis used a generic commercial rate, but stated that the numbers would be different if a restaurant were involved. Mr. Berkus added that there could be a condition of approval that there will be no restaurant in the development.

Mr. Berkus stated that easement restrictions prohibited extending garage footprint under it.

Mr. Berkus stated that, in live/work situations, peak traffic is generally reduced; daytime traffic is increased by customers. Ms. Hubbell stated that a Condition of Approval was added for the residential units that only allow home occupations as defined in the City's Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Berkus believes that occupants will be a diverse group of income and ages. Experience has shown that, in loft situations, where couples have had a baby, they typically move for additional space needs.

Mr. Berkus stated that the building heights have been reduced to meet the requirement for a cellar vs. a basement. Stated that the roof area has solar potential. Green aspects of the building will be studied.

Mr. Rosenfeld is looking into the market rate to determine 3-month relocation amount, perhaps \$800 per month as relocation amount.

Ms. Hubbell stated there is no definition of "infill" in the Zoning Ordinance; however this is infill as defined under the California Environmental Quality Act guidelines. This project qualifies for an exemption from further environmental review by meeting a set of determinations. This project has met the determinations and as a result is exempt from further environmental review.

Ms. Hubbell stated most buildings on upper State Street do not have parkways as well as sidewalks, and this project does. Expressed concern over Commission's statements regarding "full" environmental review; that would mean reviewing every single environmental impact associated with the project. The only issues being discussed are traffic and parking. A traffic EIR is not warranted on this project because it does not result in traffic impacts. EIR's can be done, but it is a Staff decision with Commissioner input.

Mr. Vincent stated that CEQA provides an administrative process, conducted by staff, at the beginning of a project. In this early stage, staff uses this process to reach an administrative decision that dictates what type of environmental document will be prepared. In this particular case, a categorical exemption was found to apply to this project; therefore there is no EIR. It is not something that the Commission can ask for at the end of the process.

Mr. Berkus stated that he would be willing to limit the commercial space to only offices in order to reduce trips. Also, stated he would be willing to set the building back 20 feet, but that could mean losing affordable units. He suggested a joint Planning Commission and ABR meeting to resolve all concerns. Mr. Berkus requested an approval or denial but not a continuance.

MOTION: White/Jacobs

Continue the item to November 3, 2005 for a concept review with SD-2 setbacks met, softened design, use of stair step design, green building aspects, bigger site plan and vicinity map, and a tenant relocation program.

Mr. Berkus asked if density is acceptable and the response from the Commission was that it will depend on the redesign.

This motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 5 Noes: 0 Abstain: 0 Absent: 2 (Maguire, Jostes)

Commission recessed at 4:45 P.M. and reconvened at 4:57 P.M.

ACTUAL TIME: 4:57 P.M.

C. APPLICATION OF STEVE FORT, TYNAN GROUP, INC., AGENT FOR MICHAEL STEVENS, PROPERTY OWNER, 210 MEIGS ROAD, APN 045-110-011, E-3,

SINGLE FAMILY, SD-3 COASTAL OVERLAY ZONES, GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: MAJOR PUBLIC & INSTITUTIONAL (MST2002-00710)

The subject property is a 53,484 (gross) square foot vacant lot (38,553 square feet net) located in the East Mesa Area adjacent to Washington School at the terminus of Lighthouse Road and across the street from La Mesa School Park. The project consists of a one lot subdivision with ten condominium units (8 market and 2 affordable), composed of two and three bedrooms, and ranging in size from 1,080 square feet to 2,409 square feet. Each unit would have two covered parking spaces and three guest parking spaces would be provided on site.

The project proposes 3,830 cubic yards of grading cut and 10 cubic yards of fill outside of building footprints. Grading under building footprints would be balanced on site involving 1,082 cubic yards. The project includes the removal of approximately 57 existing 4 to 42 inch trees, composed primarily of Eucalyptus trees and other non-natives and the installation of 63 new trees, 43 of which would be 24 inch box trees.

A zone change from E-3/S-D-3 to R-2/S-D-3 is requested. A change in the existing General Plan designation from Major Public and Institutional to Residential, 12 units per acre, and removal of a proposed park symbol would also be necessary as well as a Local Coastal Plan (LCP) Amendment because the General Plan Amendment would affect a parcel in the Coastal Zone.

The discretionary applications required for this project are:

Actions requiring a Planning Commission recommendation to the City Council and subsequent approval by the City Council and the California Coastal Commission:

1. Zoning Map Amendment to change the E-3/SD-3, Single Family Residential Zone/Coastal Overlay Zone, to R-2/SD-3, Two Family Residential Zone/Coastal Overlay Zone (SBMC §28.92.015);
2. General Plan Map Amendment to amend the General Plan Land Use Map for the subject parcel from Major Public & Institutional to Residential, 12 units per acre, which would be consistent with the proposed R-2 Zoning designation, and delete the "Proposed Park" symbol from this area; and
3. Local Coastal Plan Amendment to amend the Local Coastal Plan Land Use Map in the Coastal Zone (SBMC §28.45.009.7).

Actions by the Planning Commission contingent upon above actions by the City Council and Coastal Commission:

1. Modification to allow a wall to exceed the maximum allowable height of eight feet (SBMC§28.87.170);
2. Coastal Development Permit for a one lot subdivision to construct residential condominiums in the non-appealable jurisdiction of the Coastal Zone (SBMC §28.45.009), and
3. Tentative Subdivision Map for a one lot subdivision to construct residential condominiums (SBMC Chapter 27.07).

The Planning Commission will consider approval of the Negative Declaration prepared for the project pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines Section 15074.

Case Planner: Trish Allen, Associate Planner and Michael Berman, EA/Project Planner
Email: tallen@SantaBarbaraCA.gov and mberman@SantaBarbaraCA.gov

Trish Allen, Associate Planner, made the staff presentation:

Dave Odell, Development Partner of Michael Stevens, Owner, addressed the Commission and introduced applicant team: Pete Ehlen, Architect; David Black, Landscape Architect, and Scott Schell, Transportation Engineer.

Pete Ehlen, Architect, gave the applicant presentation.

The public hearing was opened at 5:45 P.M. and the following people spoke in opposition to the project:

David Hetyonk, Santa Barbara School District
Ed Gamble
Jill Stevens, Washington School Foundation
Tom Ochsner
Barbara Collinson
Christopher Manson-Hing, Washington School parent/neighbor
Laurie Yarnell, Washington School parent and teacher
Carol Hawkes, Washington School parent and Foundation Board member
Harriet Whaley, Washington School PTA president
John Enholm, Washington School parent
Mark Sherman, Washington School parent
Georg Naumann, Washington School parent
Tricia Guilfoyle, Washington School parent
Natasha Heiftz Campbell, Washington School parent
Sheldon Pfeifer, Washington School parent
Jose Landeros, Washington School parent
Lynn Rodriguez,
April Van Wickle, Washington School parent (letter summarized by Ms. Campbell)
Patricia Santiago, Principal, Washington Elementary School
John Gaffney, Washington School parent
Marty Ingalls, Washington School parent

The following people requested to speak in opposition of the project, but could not remain present for the entire hearing:

Nancy Harter, Santa Barbara School Board
Laura Heredia
Sunny Ingalls, Washington School parent
Elle Ingalls, Washington School parent

Jackson Eddy, Washington School student
Jackie Lincoln
April Henderson
Gabriella Frederick
Kim Baron
Joanie Lang
Barbara Colson
Toni McClintock

With no one else wishing to speak, the public hearing was closed at 6:39 P.M.

Commissioners' questions and comments:

1. Asked about zoning vs. General Plan.
2. Asked about emergency vehicle access to classrooms.
3. Asked if a stepped wall has been considered.
4. Asked developer if summer and Christmas breaks have been considered in construction scheduling.
5. Asked about financial feasibility and ratio of number of affordable units possible while still keeping financial feasibility.
6. Asked how wide is the center median; what kind of trees can be grown in the median.
7. Asked if there is a master plan for Washington School to move or eliminate the portables.
8. Struggling with zone change and project compatibility with neighborhood; excited about possibility of land swap in exchange for zone change.
9. Expressed appreciation for school participation in process; commented that it would have been better if dialogue had come sooner. Late feedback has been staggering and has impacted investment of time put in by PC Commissioners, staff and applicant.
10. Supports 8/2 ratio of affordable housing, even 7/3; would like consideration given to sidewalk extension to the South of project site; sees extension as a fair mitigation.
11. Asked for construction to accommodate school schedules; opaque fencing surrounding construction; use of Mesa Road, not school road, for construction entry. Would like to see more detail in conditions of approval.
12. Compatibility and noise issue is significant. Two story configuration results in too dense a project. Three commissioners concur on density and neighborhood incompatibility.
13. Concerned about the school having a plan for portable and temporary buildings; school buildings should not be close to the property line. If portable classrooms are moved, the problem of close proximity is solved.
14. One Commissioner stated that the density appeared to be compatible with the neighborhood.
15. Inquired about construction restrictions in conditions of approval
16. Suggests property line walls be extended 2 feet and made as sound walls to mitigate future sound issues, minimum of 5 foot wall height on school side.
17. Would like to see a different condition on construction times, after permits are pulled, that would include working out a plan between the applicant, school district and school.
18. Supports General Planning Amendment change in zoning from park to residential to establish value for the property and make it usable for a private owner.

Ms. Hubbell stated that in terms of zoning and General Plan, the General Plan and the Local Coastal Plan show the Washington School parcel and the project parcel designated as major public and institutional. The Coastal Plan designation would have to change to allow residential units on the project parcel at the E-3 Zoning designation. Ms. Hubbell noted that presently the emergency vehicle access is unauthorized and across private property.

Scott Vincent, Assistant City Attorney, responded that the Fire Department uses whatever properties necessary to put out a fire; trespassing is not a concern. It is not appropriate for the school to rely on burdening the private property for Fire Department access; Mr. Vincent does not know the school's limitations on Eminent Domain power.

Mr. Ehlen replied that a stepped wall was not adequate now.

Mr. Odell stated that they are hopeful construction dates work out with least impact; financial feasibility makes it difficult to pull permits and meet specific scheduling. Mr. Odell stated that two affordable units are the maximum number for project financial feasibility.

Mr. Ehlen stated that center median is 8-10 feet wide.

Mr. Clifford, Supervising Transportation Engineer, stated that they would work with the applicant to provide some trees, but stressed that this area, from a traffic perspective, is one that you want to "see and be seen".

Mr. Hetyonk replied that the portables are not scheduled to be eliminated; there is a plan to relocate the portables to accommodate accessibility requirements.

STRAW VOTE:

Asked how many commissioners would approve the General Plan Amendment, Local Coastal Plan Amendment and Zoning Map Amendment.

Ayes: 3 Noes: 2 (White, Larson) Abstain: 0 Absent: 2 (Maguire, Jostes)

MOTION: Myers/Jacobs

Resolution No. 065-05

Approve the Mitigated Negative Declaration as outlined in the Staff Report and recommend that City Council approve the General Plan and Local Coastal Plan Amendments and Zoning Map Amendment, as outlined in findings F 1 and 2.

This motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 3 Noes: 2 (White, Larson) Abstain: 0 Absent: 2 (Maguire, Jostes)
Commissioner Jacobs requested a reiteration of changes in conditions of approval.

Ms. Hubbell stated under B.5 in conditions of approval, there would be 2 of the two-bedroom units, instead of five for the middle-income sale restrictions. Added to Section C under Design Review,

would be the wall being raised two feet and being made a sound wall and that Units 7 and 8 be reduced in size, bulk, and scale by lowering the units into the site, reducing plate heights, etc. Flexibility would be added under Construction. Under E.3, would be the sidewalk extension all the way south to connect with Shoreline Drive.

MOTION: Jacobs/

Approve the Modifications, Coastal Development Permit, and Tentative Subdivision Map, making the findings outlined in the staff report, subject to the amended conditions of approval.

This motion failed due to lack of a second.

MOTION: Myers/

Deny the project.

This motion failed due to lack of a second.

Mr. Ehlen said zone change was encouraged by this Commission the past. He offered to make some changes to get a majority vote. An affordable mix of 8 and 3 would be considered.

Mr. White sees other options in reduction of size, bulk and scale.

Ms. Hubbell suggested a continuance for reviewing options.

Applicant will return to ABR, with the condition that Units 7 and 8 that will be redesigned to address size, bulk and scale; incorporate a reduction of plate heights; and reduce the size of the buildings as they appear to the school and surrounding areas.

AMENDED MOTION: Jacobs /Myers

Assigned Resolution No. 065-05

Resubmit previous motion to approve project with amended conditions of approval as discussed by Mr. Mahan.

Scott Vincent recommends that Staff and applicant come to an agreement of conditions, with a requirement of a consultation with Washington School, providing an opportunity to comment on the proposed construction schedule.

This motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 3 Noes: 2 (White, Larson) Abstain: 0 Absent: 2 (Maguire, Jostes)

Commissioner Mahan announced the ten calendar day appeal period.

IV. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

A. Committee and Liaison Reports.

Commissioner White attended a Parks and Recreation Commission meeting on October 12, 2005 and was impressed with landscaping and fountains that are being planned for the corners of Cota and State Street and the two blocks of State Street near Highway 101. Suggests including more information at a PC luncheon meeting.

Commissioner Larson attended the Street Light Advisory Group meeting and will meet again on November 2nd. Loma Alta lighting samples will be shown.

Commissioner Mahan attended a Highways 101 Improvement Project meeting and looked at Coast Village Road round-about and reports project is coming along nicely; CalTrans is very cooperative and creative.

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

None.

- C. Review and consideration of the following Planning Commission Resolutions and Minutes:

- a. Minutes of June 2, 2005
- b. Resolution No. 040-05
- c. Resolution No. 041-05
- d. Resolution No. 042-05
- e. Minutes of June 9, 2005
- f. Resolution No. 043-05
- g. Minutes of June 16, 2005
- h. Resolution No. 044-05
- i. Resolution No. 045-05

MOTION: White/Mahan

Approve the Minutes and related Resolutions for June 2, 9, and 16, 2005 as corrected.

This motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 5 Noes: 0 Abstain: see below Absent: 2 (Maguire, Jostes)

Commissioner White abstained from the minutes June 9

Commissioner Larson abstained from the minutes of June 2

Commissioner Jacobs abstained from Resolution No. 044-05

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Planning Commission Minutes

October 20, 2005

Page 15

The meeting was adjourned at 7:37 P.M.

Submitted by,

Deana Rae McMillion, Admin/Clerical Supervisor for Sherrell Bortman, Recording Secretary