



# City of Santa Barbara Planning Division

## PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

May 4, 2006

### **CALL TO ORDER:**

Chair John Jostes called the meeting to order at 1:09 P.M.

### **ROLL CALL:**

#### **Present:**

Chair John Jostes

Vice-Chair Charmaine Jacobs

Commissioners, Bill Mahan, George C. Myers, and Addison S. Thompson

#### **Absent:**

Harwood A. White, Jr., Stella Larson

### **STAFF PRESENT:**

Jan Hubbell, Senior Planner

Steve Foley, Project Planner

Kathleen Kennedy, Associate Planner

Rob Dayton, Supervising Transportation Planner

Victoria Johnson, Project Engineer

Judy Johnduff, Assistant Transportation Planner

Stacey Wilson, Associate Transportation Planner

Gabriela Feliciano, Commission Secretary

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

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

Senior Planner Jan Hubbell announced the following changes to the agenda:

1. Item III, Utility Undergrounding, will be continued to May 11, 2006.
2. Item IV, Traffic Workshop, will be continued to the afternoon of May 18, 2006.

- B. Announcements and appeals.

Ms. Hubbell made the following announcements:

1. The 1464 La Cima Road appeal is scheduled for City Council on May 23, 2006. Commissioner Jostes will attend, representing the Planning Commission.
  2. The 210 Meigs Road appeal will be heard by City Council on June 13, 2006 at the 6 P.M. hearing. Commissioners Jacobs and White will attend.
- C. Comments from members of the public pertaining to items not on this agenda.  
Chair Jostes opened the public hearing at 1:11 P.M. With no one wishing to speak, the public hearing was closed at 1:11 P.M.

**II. RECOMMENDATION TO CITY COUNCIL:**

**PROJECT SELECTION FOR CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION  
RULE 20A UTILITY UNDERGROUNDING PROJECTS Continued to May 11, 2006**

Recommendation to City Council for priority undergrounding projects funded through Rule 20A funds.

Case Planner: Homer Smith, Principal Engineer  
Email: hsmith@SantaBarbaraCA.gov

**III. NEW ITEMS:**

**ACTUAL TIME: 1:12 P.M.**

**A. APPLICATION OF PETER W. HUNT, ARCHITECT, FOR LLOYD G. TUPPER TRUST, PROPERTY OWNER, 15 E. ISLAY STREET AND 15 E. ISLAY STREET (UNITS A-D), APN 027-032-015 & -016, R-1, ONE-FAMILY RESIDENCE ZONE, GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: BUFFER/ GENERAL COMMERCE/ OFFICES (MST2005-00346)**

The project consists of the conversion of five existing, detached residential units to condominiums. There is currently one (1) one-bedroom unit, four (4) two-bedroom units and five uncovered parking spaces onsite. No new development is proposed. The project site consists of 13,853 square feet. Two exceptions to the required physical standards for condominium conversions are requested. One exception is to allow five parking spaces instead of ten and the other exception is to provide no additional private storage space for each unit.

The discretionary applications required for this project are:

1. A Modification to allow two as-built lamp posts and gates to be a maximum of eight feet high instead of the maximum allowable height of three and one-half feet at the driveway entrance along the front property line (SBMC§28. 87.170);

2. A Tentative Subdivision Map to allow a one-lot subdivision to create five residential condominium units (SBMC§27.07); and
3. A Condominium Conversion Permit to convert five existing detached residential units to five condominium units (SBMC§28.88).

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).

Case Planner: Kathleen Kennedy, Associate Planner

Email: [kkennedy@santabarbaraca.gov](mailto:kkennedy@santabarbaraca.gov)

Kathleen Kennedy, Associate Planner, gave the Staff presentation and added that two letters from the public, in support of the project, were received and distributed to the Commission.

Commissioner's comments and questions:

1. Asked for clarification of the parking and the proximity to the Central Business District.
2. Referenced the storage space issue and asked for examples of design features and amenities that would be offsetting.

Ms. Kennedy clarified the parking and stated that the parking was within two blocks north of the Central Business District.

Ms. Hubbell addressed the private storage issue.

Peter Hunt, architect, representing the applicant, stated that the units were built in 1918 with 5 parking spaces that have worked well for over eighty years. In addition, each unit is built separately and has had limited storage.

Chair Jostes opened the public hearing at 1:22 P.M. With no one wishing to speak, the public hearing was closed at 1:22 P.M.

Commissioner's comments and questions:

1. Appreciates the attention to detail in renovating the bungalows and can support the conversion permit, including the waiver for parking and storage requirements.
2. Stated that this street might benefit from a Residential Parking Permit program so that residents may be able to find parking without competing with Downtown employees.
3. Understood the intent of the storage requirement was to keep people from storing personal belongings in front yards and in view of others, and to avoid debris or untended areas. Does not support the adding of storage sheds and finds them

- unappealing. Would like the CC&R's to include wording that people will not put up garden sheds. Asked if there is existing access to attic space available in each unit.
4. Acknowledged existing storage and nearby public storage options, but storage for other items, such as gardening tools, paint, etc. should be accommodated; perhaps with a smaller waterproof, lift-up-lid locker, approximately 50 cubic feet, could reasonably address the requirement. Feels that any storage attached to the units would be in good taste and suit each individual house appropriately. Suggested that the applicant work with the Architectural Board of Review (ABR) to find a place to attach a storage bin to the house.
  5. Feels the existing gates are not consistent with the project and subtract from the project. Noted a health and safety issue with the poor visibility of children on the sidewalk; cannot support modification for the gates.
  6. Supports the parking modification.
  7. Feels that the gates add character to the property and supports keeping them. Cited hedges in neighborhood that create greater visibility issues.
  8. Approves of the architecture and attention to detail.
  9. Finds the gates to be questionable. Concerned with the "as built" nature of the gates.
  10. Asked Staff if prior projects have been conditioned with sub-standard storage requirements to provide off-site storage; asked if this would be precedent-setting.
  11. Agrees with peers that gates provide nice architectural detail, even if not necessarily the same architecture as the buildings. Supports having the gates remain.

Ms. Hubbell explained the need for the storage requirement and how many of the apartment to condominium conversions do not include garages and requires storage for anything from Christmas items to seasonal use items. Condominiums typically do not require many gardening items because of general maintenance. In some instances, approvals without storage have been made, such as with historic buildings. She also noted that accessible attic space has been found to be an acceptable solution, and stated that it might be possible for this project, given the peaked roofs.

Ross Foti, owner's representative and resident, stated that each unit has access to attic space and suggested that nearby public storage could also be used. He stated that each unit has access to attic space.

**MOTION: Mahan/Jacobs**

**Assigned Resolution No. 018-06**

Approve the Tentative Subdivision Map and the Condominium Conversion, including the parking and storage waivers, but not the modification, making the findings outlined in the staff report, subject to the Conditions of Approval, with an additional condition requiring 50 cubic feet of storage attached to the building exterior of the building for each unit, subject to review and approval of the design by the Architectural Board of Review.

This motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 5 Noes: 0 Abstain: 0 Absent: 2 (White/Larson)

Commissioner's comments:

1. Reiterated issue of safety regarding the gates and that it cannot be compared to other existing hedges in neighborhood. The visibility in this project is partially blocked and can endanger a toddler on a tricycle. The architect can design something that is more in keeping with the architecture and is safer.
2. Asked if the concern was solely with gate, or with gate and post.
3. If the gates were removed, the safety issue would be considerably reduced. Noted that the chimneys are stucco with brick showing; suggested brick column be in stucco with corners chipped off to show bricks to be more compatible with the architecture. Suggests gates be moved elsewhere where they would be set back and not a safety issue.
4. Stated that the modification is for the gates and for the post with lamps. Feels that the lamps are important to the neighborhood because of minimal street lighting and that the lampposts are appreciated by the neighborhood. Would like to hear from the applicant on the gate discussion. Feels that gates are in keeping with the neighborhood, but does have safety issue and condition of gates.

Mr. Hunt showed pictures of other gates in the neighborhood. Agrees that the gates could be removed, but would like to keep the lamp posts.

Lloyd Tupper, owner, added that the gates could be easily removed and is willing to have them removed for maintaining safety. Agrees to adding stucco to the columns.

**MOTION: Mahan/Myers**

**Assigned Resolution No. 018-06**

Approve the modification making the findings for: 1) The modifications of the columns and lights with addition of some stucco to the columns to match project chimneys, and 2) Removal of the gates, subject to approval by the Architectural Board of Review.

This motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 5 Noes: 0 Abstain: 0 Absent: 2 (White/Larson)

Chair Jostes announced the ten calendar day appeal period.

**ACTUAL TIME: 1:55 P.M.**

- B. APPLICATION OF STEVEN YATES, THE CONCEPTUAL MOTION COMPANY, AGENT FOR STEVE DELSON, 210 W. CARRILLO STREET, ASSESSORS PARCEL NUMBER 039-271-025, C-2 ZONE, GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: GENERAL COMMERCE (MST2005-00772)**

The project consists of the conceptual review of the demolition of the Carrillo Plaza/Radio Square commercial site containing 18,939 square feet of various retail and service commercial uses and constructing a four-story mixed use project with 55 residential units and 20,684 square feet of commercial space. The commercial space would include 17,385 square feet of retail commercial space and 3,299 square feet of live / work commercial and office space located in three ground floor units. Subterranean parking is proposed with a total of 186 parking spaces. Vehicular access to and from the parking area is proposed with an entrance and exit ramp along Carrillo Street and an exit ramp to De La Vina Street.

The purpose of the concept review is to allow the Planning Commission an opportunity to review the proposed project design at a conceptual level and provide the Applicant and Staff with feedback and direction regarding the proposed land use and design. No formal action on the development proposal will be taken at the concept review, nor will any determination be made regarding environmental review of the proposed project. Upon review and formal action on the application for the development proposal, the proposed project will require the following discretionary applications:

4. A Modification of the lot area requirements to allow 25 over-density units (bonus density) on a lot in the C-2 Zone (SBMC §28.21.080, SBMC §28.92.026.A);
5. A Tentative Subdivision Map for a one-lot subdivision to create fifty five (55) residential condominium units and 19,088 square feet of commercial condominium space (SBMC 27.07 and 27.13).

Case Planner: Steve Foley, Project Planner  
Email: sfoley@santabarbaraca.gov

Steve Foley, Project Planner, gave the Staff presentation.

Steve Delson, owner, introduced his team: Steve Yates, President of Conceptual Motion Company; Gerhard Mayer, Architect; Dan Weber, Project Manager; and Katie O'Reilly Rogers, Landscape Architect. Mr. Yates gave the applicant presentation.

Chair Jostes opened the public hearing at 2:33 P.M.

The following people spoke in support of the project:

1. Joan Livingston, former Chair for the Westside Study Group.
2. Steve Amerikaner, representing the Coastal Housing Coalition
3. Steve Cushman, President of the Santa Barbara Chamber of Commerce

With no one else wishing to speak, the public hearing was closed at 2:45 P.M.

Commissioner's comments and questions:

1. Asked if a brief traffic analysis was needed to see what the project looks like from the applicant's standpoint.
2. Asked what the level of service is from Carrillo Street to Highway 101 during peak evening hours.
3. Asked staff for projection of traffic impact with the addition of 55 units to the site.
4. Asked if "ghost" counts could be included as part of the traffic analysis.
5. Commented on the elevations, noting that the Carrillo floor plate is 17 feet. Asked if all the floors are intended to be the same height and if the scale of the Carrillo Street building could be brought down without ending up with such tall floor heights.
6. Noted only one handicapped parking space in the parking plans and asked if that was sufficient to meet the ADA requirements.
7. Expressed appreciation for the presentation. Agreed that the site requires redevelopment. Arms are always open to density when it provides a high percentage of affordable units.
8. Concerned with the overall size and height of the project; same concerns as expressed by the Historic Landmarks Commission. Would like to see the floor levels brought down. Asked applicant to consider sloping down the ramps between buildings and still meet handicapped standards to bring the floor to floor height down. There is a relationship between setbacks and height of buildings. Suggests pushing back the height on property toward the north side of the project. Also, setting back the high end units on the 4<sup>th</sup> floor to overlook the rooftops of the lower buildings; positive to move away from the noise factor.
9. Likes the plaza on the corner; very important corner at De la Vina Street. The interior plazas are too small compared to the building heights of the project. Suggests that the paseos can be narrow, such as the El Paseo, that goes into a larger plaza. Would like to see a computer-generated model of the sun and shade in the paseos. Unlike Andalucia that gets lots of sun, these paseos would need sun; shadowed paseos are not desirable due to Santa Barbara's much milder climate and coastal influence.
10. In terms of the density, if some of the buildings come down in size, then some square footage would be lost. Suggest that some consideration be given to transferring development rights for some of the commercial space; could offset the loss of square footage. Suggests considering more residential on the first floor. Supports underground parking and cleaning up soil.
11. Suggested fitting as many dwellings as possible while keeping a high level of architectural design. Suggest reducing the volume by about 10%. Must maintain a high level of standards for good traffic circulation, as this section of Carrillo Street is a gateway to the City as specified in the General Plan.
12. Concurs that paseos need to be functional and not only be open space. The corner paseo is great, but suggests putting residential on ground floor, even across from Ralph's. Suggests looking at paseos that work and that make use of windows. Also, look at paseos that don't work and why.

13. Walkability and human interaction are good. The underground parking is excellent. The mixed use and range of units are needed. Concur with fellow commissioners on paseos and suggests that future connections of paseos with adjacent properties be considered. Supports the open square on the corner of the Carrillo and De la Vina Streets and does not believe in giving in to automobiles.
14. Concerned that the 1<sup>st</sup> floor height along Carrillo is too high and gives the impression from the street that it is too massive. Suggested that Transportation Staff look at a controlled left turn off of Carrillo into the parking garage to avoid drivers having to go around the block to access the garage.
15. Embraces smart growth principles and forward thinking that is consistent with City's policies.
16. Consensus of Commissioners agrees on moving the 4 story elements back. Benefits include protecting the views, breaking up the echo effect, and reducing noise. Has a hard time with 4-story building on Carrillo street; can support a 4 story building in downtown, but not on Carrillo Street. Carrillo Street is the gateway to downtown Santa Barbara. Would like to see visual studies showing the pedestrian level from all angles. If the pedestrian cannot see the 4<sup>th</sup> story from across the street, then the height is set back properly.
17. Suggests encouraging pedestrians to make use of neighborhood. The corner of Carrillo and De la Vina is very loud; anything that can cut down noise factor would be appreciated. Noise blocking walls are suggested.
18. Impressed with how issues were defined in presentation. The architecture is different and attractive; look forward to walking through the paseos and seeing the details. Use of open space is appreciated, but needs more thought to be inviting. The General Plan policy issues need to be addressed. The current General Plan looks at this as a smaller 2-story block face as opposed to a 3-story block face. A 3-story façade may be better than a 4 story façade along the Carrillo elevation, but still maintaining the opportunity to go up to 4-stories in the interior portion for a village feel. Need ground floor paseos. Appreciates variety in unit size. The final environmental review will contribute to determine intensity of use. Suggest cutting down commercial to give way to more housing.
19. Asked how unit owners are matched to downtown businesses. Would like to hear a more compelling argument as to why there will be fewer trips with this project by adding residents to downtown. Asked how measure E limitations apply.
20. Suggested that perhaps the Coastal Housing Coalition could talk to larger downtown employers and suggest ownership of some of these units that could be shared with some of their employees similar to Cottage Hospital concept. Although a private endeavor, this should be encouraged.
21. Commented that plazas and sidewalk cafés in other cities are very noisy and that perhaps we are worrying too much about street noise. Suggested smooth paving on street to aid in noise reduction.

Rob Dayton, Supervising Transportation Planner, responded that the applicant has been requested to provide a traffic analysis. Mr. Dayton also introduced Judy Johnduff as the Assistant Transportation Planner working on this project.



Mr. Dayton stated that the level of service during P.M. peak hours is level 'D', but it has not been counted in a while and could possibly be worse. If you are getting on the freeway, the level of service could be level 'F'; however, if you are traveling from the west side direction, the level of service could be a level 'B'. The average is 'D' for that interchange. Mr. Dayton would not speculate on the traffic impact with the proposed 55 units; a traffic analysis would be needed. Mr. Delson added that the applicant will be providing 24/7 traffic counts as part of the analysis to be submitted.

Gerhard Mayer, architect, explained the elevations and stated that the height quoted is the highest point. All ADA compliance has been met with six handicapped spaces, including one van space.

Mr. Foley stated that this project would result in a Minor Addition and that Measure E would not kick in.

Mr. Delson thanked the Commission for its input and will review all comments made.

**IV. DISCUSSION ITEM:**

**TRAFFIC CONGESTION WORKSHOP Continued to May 18, 2006**

Staff will make a presentation on existing traffic in the City and how traffic levels of service are calculated.

Case Planner: Rob Dayton, Supervising Transportation Planner

Email: rdayton@santabarbaraca.gov

**V. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA**

A. Committee and Liaison Reports.

1. Commissioner Thompson reported on the Airport Commission. The Airport Terminal Project will continue with the subcommittee and newly selected architect meeting on May 24<sup>th</sup>. City Council approved their contract on May 2<sup>nd</sup>.

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

None were requested.

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

1. Minutes of March 16, 2006
2. Resolution 013-06  
2 Santa Cruz Boulevard

3. Resolution 014-06  
1642 Shoreline Drive
4. Minutes of April 13, 2006
5. Resolution 016-06  
40 Cass Place

**MOTION: Mahan/Myers** Approve the preceding minutes and resolutions as corrected.

This motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 5 Noes: 0 Abstain: As noted below Absent: 2(White/Larson)

Commissioner Mahan abstained from the Minutes of April 13<sup>th</sup>

**MOTION: Mahan/Thompson**

Continue the Minutes of April 6<sup>th</sup>, and Resolution 015-06, 1464 La Cima Road, for review by the City Attorney.

Ayes: 4 Noes: 0 Abstain: 1 (Jacobs) Absent: 2 (White/Larson)

**VII. ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Jostes adjourned the meeting at 3:33 P.M.

Submitted by,

---

Gabriela Feliciano, Commission Secretary