



City of Santa Barbara Planning Division

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

February 9, 2006

CALL TO ORDER:

Chair John Jostes called the meeting to order at 1:02 p.m.

ROLL CALL:

Present:

Chair John Jostes

Vice-Chair Charmaine Jacobs

Commissioners, Bill Mahan, George C. Myers, Addison S. Thompson and Harwood A. White, Jr.

Absent:

Stella Larson

STAFF PRESENT:

Bettie Weiss, City Planner

Jan Hubbell, Senior Planner

Marisela Salinas, Associate Planner

Chelsey Swanson, Assistant Planner

Laurie Owens, Project Planner

Stacey Wilson, Associate Transportation Planner

Hazel Johns, Assistant Airport Director

N. Scott Vincent, Assistant City Attorney

Julie Rodriguez, Planning Commission Secretary

I. PRELIMINARY MATTERS:

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

None.

- B. Announcements and appeals.

Ms. Hubbell made the following announcements:

1. Julie Rodriguez accepted the position of Planning Commission Secretary.

2. City Council denied the appeal of the Planning Commission's approval of the project at 1822 San Pascual Street on Tuesday.

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

Commissioner Jostes opened the public comment at 1:04 P.M. and with no one wishing to speak closed the public comment at 1:04 P.M.

II. CONSENT ITEM: CONTINUED FROM 2/2/06

ACTUAL TIME: 1:04 P.M.

APPLICATION OF JOHN ENTIKAMP, CFO, AGENT FOR MERCURY AIR CENTER, 454 WILLIAM MOFFETT PLACE, SANTA BARBARA, CA 93117, 073-045-003, A-F AIRPORT FACILITIES, AND S-D-3 COASTAL OVERLAY, ZONES, GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: MAJOR PUBLIC AND INSTITUTIONAL (MST2005-00219)

The proposed project would involve a 1,200 square foot (sq. ft.) addition to and remodel of the existing 2,207 sq. ft. Mercury Air Service Center. The project would also include demolition of the existing 8,290 sq. ft. Hangar 6 and expansion of the aircraft parking ramp by approximately 80,000 square feet. The discretionary application required for this project is a Coastal Development Permit for construction of improvements in the Appealable Jurisdiction of the Coastal Zone (SBMC § 28.45.009).

Case Planner: Laurie Owens, Project Planner
Email: lowens@santabarbaraca.gov

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

MOTION: Mahan/Myers

Waive the Staff Report

This motion carried by the following vote:

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

Commissioner's questions and comments:

1. Asked about sidewalks.
2. Asked about the landscaping and bio swale.
3. Asked about project development relative to flood plain.
4. Asked for clarification of sidewalk extension in parking lot.
5. Asked what occurs in 2013 when lease expires. Asked if what is proposed today would be gone by 2013. Asked if Mercury would continue to occupy the site on a month to month basis.

6. Encouraged sidewalk addition wherever possible. Would like to see pedestrian access that will address the drainage ditch.
7. Asked if new parking lot will fit into any of the future plans for the area.
8. Asked if new parking lot will be concrete or asphalt.
9. Asked staff if old lighting poles could be salvaged when removing the cobra head lighting fixtures. Asked if replacing the lighting fixtures is in the Planning Commission's discretion. Estimates that the cost should be around \$1,000 per light fixture for revamping. Asked if applicant would agree to pay approximately \$2,000 for lighting improvements.
10. Asked about new airport terminal and prior request that sidewalk continue to new terminal. It appears that landscaping could be considered.
11. Would like to see better improvement for providing pedestrian use and access to the beach areas.
12. Suggest exploring the possibility of the building lasting longer than 2014.
13. Agrees that this project is a good project for all involved; improvements will be good for everyone.
14. Asked if there was any articulation of street plans.
15. Asked if bicycle parking and employee parking lot on the north side of the proposed addition will remain the same.

Ms. Hubbell stated that sidewalks would not be proposed because of existing drainage adjacent to roadway. She added that because the area will be subject to change, as part of the terminal in the future, there would not be an inclination to address the sidewalks without looking at the broader project. Also, the Municipal Code sidewalk in full requirements does not apply.

Ed Lenvik, applicant, stated that there are some bio swales in the design where water runs to the south. He stated that they are in the flood zone, but are installing flood gates. Any changes in the street lights are not in the scope or the responsibility of the applicant.

Hazel Johns, Assistant Airport Director, explained that two leases come up in 2013. At that time, the two leases will either be renegotiated, or a competitive bid for new fixed base operators (FBO's) will take place. The area where Mercury is located is designated for future expansion of the airline terminal. Mercury's leasehold would go away; the terminal could be expanded out to the south; a parking structure could be developed. Ms. Johns stated that the structures and parking lot would be temporary.

Ms. Johns stated that the new parking lot will not fit into future plans; it is envisioned that the lot would be leveled and replaced with a parking structure. The new parking lot will be asphalt.

Ms. Hubbell stated that replacing the city light fixtures is within the Commission's discretion. The applicant's request is for a small addition to an existing business. There is a nexus, but is it proportional?

Mr. Lenvik stated that the cost of lighting improvement vs. the short amount of time remaining on the applicant's lease does not seem an ethical request.

Ms. Johns stated that the aircraft parking ramp is being expanded and is the reason why the parking lot cannot be moved more to the east.

Ms. Hubbell stated that the plans show there is not a pedestrian connection to this leasehold during the first phase of the terminal project.

Mr. Lenvik stated that consideration should be given as to what extent the sidewalk would take of the property frontage. Also, stated that request would entail a Coastal Commission review and EIR, both of which would be a lot to ask of the applicant.

Ms. Johns responded that the sidewalk length is about 1400 feet, which is expensive, and the area has limited pedestrian use.

Mr. Lenvik stated that the parking lots that are being installed will be consistent with the short term parking lot. The current employee lot will remain as Mercury Air employee parking with limited access.

Commissioner Jostes opened the public comment at 1:39 P.M. and with no one wishing to speak closed the public comment at 1:39 P.M.

Commissioner comments:

1. Feels that the Planning Commission is making assumptions on pedestrian needs without knowing the reality of pedestrian use. Recommends that a broader master pedestrian plan be studied.
2. Commented on Airport Master Plan and need to include pedestrian travel component when opportunity arises.
3. Added that Airport Master Plan should include pedestrian plan and entire Airport area and not just area near terminal.
4. Supports project, but does not support requiring the upgrade of streetlights across the street.

MOTION: Mahan/White

Assigned Resolution No. 006-06

Approve the project, making the findings for the Coastal Development Permit, with the conditions revised to require that the cobra head light fixtures on the two existing light poles across the street from the project be replaced, with a not-to-exceed cost of \$2,000, and the design of the replacement light fixtures shall be consistent with the recommendations by the Street Light Advisory Group recommendations for the Airport area.

Ms. Johns will take the request to study a master pedestrian plan back to the Airport Commission.

Ms. Hubbell commented that the Airport Master Plan focused on the airfield issues, not the street-side issues, except as directly connected to access to the airfield.

This motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 5 Noes: 1 (Thompson) Abstain: 0 Absent: 1 (Larson)

Chair Jostes announced the ten calendar day appeal period.

III. NEW ITEM:

ACTUAL TIME: 1:47 P.M.

APPLICATION OF DIANNE JOHNSON, PRESIDENT OF LA COLINA OAKS OWNERS ASSOCIATION, 3983-4010 PRIMAVERA RD, APN 057-420-001 - 057-420-026, E-3/SD-2 ZONES, GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: MAJOR PUBLIC AND INSTITUTIONAL AND RESIDENTIAL, 12 UNITS/ACRE (MST2005-00768)

The project consists of a proposal to amend a Planning Commission condition of approval for a Tentative Subdivision Map, which limited the total square footage of all buildings on residential parcels within the La Colina Oaks subdivision to a maximum of 2,300 square feet, including a two-car garage.

The discretionary application required for this project is:

1. Amendment of the Planning Commission Conditions of Approval for a Tentative Subdivision Map (SBMC §27.07) to remove the condition restricting home sizes; to remove a condition that automatically requires any exterior alterations to be reviewed by the Architectural Board of Review (ABR); and to remove a condition that automatically requires any modification be reviewed by the Planning Commission.,

The Environmental Analyst has determined that the project is exempt from further environmental review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Guidelines Section 15305 (Minor Alterations in Land Use Limitations).

Case Planner: Chelsey Swanson, Assistant Planner

Email: cswanson@SantaBarbaraCA.gov

Chelsey Swanson, Assistant Planner, gave the Staff Report.

Commissioner's questions and comments:

1. Asked for status of the new Neighborhood Preservation Ordinance (NPO).
2. Asked how long the interim ordinance stays in place.
3. Asked if additions have been approved for some houses.
4. Asked about E-3 lot area requirement.
5. Referenced the resolution from the original approval and asked if there was a statement of overriding considerations made for a significant adverse impact.
6. Asked if this project was a rezone or annexation.
7. Asked if there is public access to the open space on the property.

8. Asked if all residents of 3093-4010 Primavera are co-applicants.
9. Referenced the NPO and asked about the potential, future Floor to Lot Area Ratio (FAR) maximums; looking at additions of 600 square feet or less, in most cases.
10. Asked where the three lots that are over 10,000 square feet are located.
11. Asked if this project goes to ABR.
12. Asked about original environmental document on the subdivision.
13. Asked if this project paid Outer State Street cumulative traffic mitigation trip and bridge fees.
14. Does not see any reason why this neighborhood development should be treated differently than others in the City. Would like to see NPO given the opportunity to develop and work.
15. Asked why restriction existed.
16. Consensus of Commissioners expressed support for project.
17. Asked if this project has been amply noticed.
18. Asked about the large open space and regretted that there was no public access of the space.
19. Asked the applicant if the association has a design review process in place.
20. Suggested avoiding neighborhood compatibility issues by conditioning any addition to have ABR review.
21. Asked about carports in neighborhood.
22. Asked if CCRs could be amended by simple majority.

Ms. Hubbell gave status of Neighborhood Preservation Ordinance. Ms. Hubbell stated that there were some additions approved for some lots prior to better tracking mechanisms being in place. The minimum required E-3 parcel size is 7,500 square feet and can be reduced when using the PRD to 6,000 square feet.

Ms. Hubbell responded that the resolution reference was to the outer state street EIR for traffic impacts. A Statement of Overriding Considerations was made and traffic mitigation fees were paid by the project.

Ms. Hubbell stated that this project is not an annexation, only a subdivision of existing property that was already zoned as E-3. Ms. Hubbell added that the open space is on private property. Ms. Hubbell stated that homeowners association is the applicant for all of the homeowners within the association.

Staff showed examples of potential future FAR maximums and home sizes based on the update of the Neighborhood Preservation Ordinance. Staff showed the Commission where the 10,000 square foot lots are on the site map.

Ms. Hubbell distinguished that single story homes would not have to go to ABR; only second story homes.

Diane Johnson, President of La Colina Neighborhood Association, introduced herself and remained available to address questions from the Planning Commission. She stated that the Neighborhood Association had looked at the cost of the permit process and made a unanimous decision to apply as an entire association, with each homeowner being assessed a portion of the cost.

Commissioner Jostes opened the public hearing at 2:03 P.M. and with no one wishing to speak, closed the public hearing at 2:03 P.M.

Ms. Hubbell added that the restriction was imposed to maintain neighborhood compatibility.

Ms. Hubbell stated the noticing included, not only property owners within the subdivision, but 450 feet around the subdivision.

Mr. Josetes re-opened the public comment at 2:12 PM, and the following speaker came forward:

Jim Ebeling: public access

Ms. Johnson addressed questions from the Commission.

Mr. Vincent added that he and Staff had discussed the CC&Rs on the property and their potential for amendment. This project was not treated any differently with regard to the NPO. Mr. Vincent added that typically CC&Rs contain the language for amending them.

MOTION: White/Thompson

Assigned Resolution No. 007-06

Approve to remove the three Conditions of Approval of the Primavera Road Subdivision.

This motion carried by the following vote:

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

Chair Jostes announced the ten calendar day appeal period.

IV. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

A. Committee and Liaison Reports.

Commissioner Mahan gave an update on the 101 Design Review Committee. The Committee reviewed bridge details, retaining wall details, and wood retaining walls.

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

None were requested.

- C. Review and consideration of the following Planning Commission Resolutions and Minutes:
- a. January 12, 2006
 - b. Resolution 002-06
 - c. Resolution 080-05 Continued from 2/2/06

MOTION: Mahan/Jacobs

Approve the minutes and resolutions as corrected.

This motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 6 Noes: 0 Abstain: As noted below Absent: 1 (Larson)

Commissioner Thompson abstained on Resolution 80-05

V. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Jostes adjourned the meeting at 2:20 P.M.

Submitted by,

Julie Rodriguez, Acting Planning Commission Secretary