



City of Santa Barbara Planning Division

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

June 15, 2006

CALL TO ORDER:

Chair John Jostes called the meeting to order at 1:04 P.M.

ROLL CALL:

Present:

Chair John Jostes

Vice-Chair Charmaine Jacobs

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

Absent:

None

STAFF PRESENT:

Bettie Weiss, City Planner

Jan Hubbell, Senior Planner

Debra Andaloro, Environmental Analyst

Victoria Greene, Project Planner

Sarah Knecht, 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. Pete Lawson, new Associate Planner in Development Review, was introduced to the Commission.
2. The 85 N. La Cumbre project is being appealed to City Council; date to be confirmed.

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

Chair Jostes opened the public hearing at 1:05 P.M.

Debbie and Tim Foley, residents of 1383 Santa Teresita, spoke regarding permits issued to adjacent neighbor.

With no one else wishing to speak, Chair Jostes closed the public hearing at 1:13 P.M.

II. CONSENT ITEM:

ACTUAL TIME: 1:13P.M.

APPLICATION OF JEFF MCKEE, AGENT FOR CITY OF SANTA BARBARA, 500 JAMES FOWLER ROAD, 073-045-003, A-A-O, S-D-3, AIRPORT APPROACH AND OPERATIONS, AND COASTAL OVERLAY ZONES, GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: MAJOR PUBLIC AND INSTITUTIONAL (MST 2005-00394, CDP2005-00394)

The proposed project involves the creation of a World War II (WWII) Memorial on Airport Property to honor local aviators who lost their lives and to commemorate those who served at the Marine Corps Air Station, Santa Barbara. The project would be located adjacent to the Airport Vista in the Long Term Parking Lot. The discretionary application required for this project is a Coastal Development Permit to construct a WWII Memorial in the Appealable Jurisdiction of the Coastal Zone (SBMC § 28.45.009).

The Environmental Analyst has determined that the project is exempt from further environmental review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Guidelines Sections 15303 and 15304.

Case Planner: Andrew Bermond, Assistant Planner
Email: abermond@ SantaBarbaraCA.gov

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

MOTION: White/Thompson

Waive the Staff Report

This motion carried by the following vote:

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

Commissioner White asked for a brief summary of the project for the benefit of the viewing public.

Jeff McKee, Administrative Analyst and applicant, described the World War II Memorial planned on the project site.

Commissioner's questions and comments:

1. Asked for a clear idea of where the Memorial will be located.
2. Reminded Staff that future projects, even consent, should include transparencies that can be shared with the public.
3. Asked if the project was reviewed by ABR and will return to ABR after PC review.
4. Asked how long the project has been in the works.
5. Acknowledged that this Memorial appropriately recognizes Veterans on a site that was once a World War II site.

Mr. McKee stated the Memorial will be placed near the terminal, overlooking the hangar.

Ms. Hubbell stated that the project will return to ABR.

Mr. McKee stated the project has evolved over the past year and a half and has included working with other groups.

MOTION: Thompson/Jacobs

Assigned Resolution No. 023-06

Approve the project, making the findings and subject to the Conditions of Approval as submitted in the Staff Report.

This motion carried by the following vote:

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

III. ENVIRONMENTAL HEARING:

ACTUAL TIME: 1:21 P.M.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT SCOPING HEARING FOR AN APPLICATION BY PEIKERT GROUP ARCHITECTS, AGENT FOR BERMANT HOMES AND THE HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF SANTA BARBARA, 535 E. MONTECITO STREET, APN 031-350-010; M-1 LIGHT MANUFACTURING, ZONE; GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: INDUSTRIAL; MST 2004-00235

The proposed project involves the construction of a mixed use building of 198,031 square feet. The 52 foot tall, four-story building would include 90 residential condominiums, 6,612 square feet of commercial space, and a 139 space parking lot. Of the 90 proposed residential units, 54-66 would be affordable pursuant to City Affordability requirements. The remaining units would be sold at below or at market prices depending upon the program

selected by the applicant and decision-makers. Permitted uses in the commercial space would be as allowed under the proposed Specific Plan. Ingress to the proposed parking garage would be from Calle Ceasar Chavez. Egress would be onto East Montecito Street.

An Initial Study has been prepared and the City Environmental Analyst has determined that an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) will be prepared to evaluate the potentially significant effects of the proposed development on the physical environment. The EIR scope of analysis would include evaluation of potentially significant project effects on traffic and parking. The Initial Study found that other environmental impacts of the project would be mitigated to less than significant levels.

The purpose of the hearing is to receive comments on the proposed EIR scope of analysis. Written comments may also be submitted to the City Planning Division not later than June 30, 2004, at 4:30 P.M.

Case Planner: Victoria Greene, Project Planner
Email: vgreene@SantaBarbaraCA.gov

Victoria Greene, Project Planner, gave the Staff presentation.

Commissioner's comment's and questions:

1. Asked to see transparencies of the project for the benefit of the viewing public.
2. Asked for definition of the elevations involved in the project.

Ms. Greene gave an expanded presentation showing pictures of the project. Ms. Greene showed the project elevations.

Chair Jostes opened the public hearing at 1:31 P.M.

The following people spoke:

Naomi Kovacs, Citizens Planning Association, noted that City Council initiated the rezone for a 100% affordable project and asked the Commission to send the project back to the City Council before initiating environmental review.

Cathie McCammon, League of Women Voters, expressed concerns about size and bulk of the project, view loss, insufficient parking, drainage issues and economic impacts on surrounding properties. Asked how drainage would be addressed.

With no one else wishing to speak, the public hearing was closed at 1:34 P.M.

Commissioner's comments and questions:

1. Asked if the project was initiated as 100 per cent affordable housing by City Council.

2. Felt that EIR scoping might be premature since the City Council will be reviewing the project again.
3. Recalled having reviewed the project earlier and having sent it to Council with the recommendation that this would be an appropriate use of the M-1 zone. Feels that perhaps the Commission should make a recommendation regarding affordability to the City Council.
4. Would like to see aesthetics issues and views incorporated in the EIR. Recalls that it was intended to be 100 % affordable housing; cannot support as presented today.
5. Consensus of Commissioners could not support a parking modification to provide required parking on-street and felt the project needs to have self-contained parking.
6. Recalls having reviewed the mass, bulk and scale of the project and feels that it is still an issue. Noted that the smells of the recycling center drift over the project site and should be considered in the environmental scope.
7. Does not feel the project is compatible with other M-1 projects. Would like to see access to recreational facilities addressed in the initial study. The discrepancy between market rate rental and market rate sale is significant enough to be considered.
8. Suggested a comprehensive size, bulk and scale section in the EIR scoping. The impact on the city will be significant and needs to take into account how the project will be viewed from many sections of the city, including driving by. Also what alternative project designs might mitigate the aesthetic issues.
9. A consensus of Commissioners expressed concern over the proposal having been initially addressed as 100% affordable housing and now being scaled back.
10. Feels that it is important to include articulation of the specific plan in the EIR, rather than after. The location is good for the project, but the concerns have to be addressed first. The land use section needs to deal with land use compatibility issues, as well as policy consistency. The parking shortfall is also of concern.
11. Wants to see what recreational options are available in a visual presentation. Suggested part of the discussion be directed to impacts, with elaboration on distinct parts of the project.
12. Asked Staff about the demographics of prospective residents of the project, and whether that affects any alternative.
13. The Commission is looking to the EIR to give an objective view on parking options. Most of the Commissioners want to see the study before making any decisions. Need to look at the deficit parking in the neighborhood.
14. Alternatives to the project should include a 100% affordable project, and look at rental versus ownership housing.

Ms. Greene stated that the project did change from 100% affordable housing due to rising building costs.

Ms. Hubbell stated why the environmental scoping was appropriate. Ms. Hubbell reminded the Commission that it had expressed the desire that the housing be kept as affordable as possible. The project has tried to comply with the directive, but has been challenged by rising building costs.

Debra Andaloro, Environmental Analyst, addressed the Commission's parking concerns. Suggested that some issues could be addressed in the Planning Commission staff report, rather than becoming EIR issues. Addressed the parks and recreation issues; Condition, Trends and Issues (CTI) Reports have been done that show the project area has more nearby parks than other areas in the city. In exploring alternatives, commented on the possibility of using the site under its existing zoning and building it out.

Ms. Andaloro responded that one component of the EIR will cover demographics. Much of the information that came out of today's hearing, such as the affordability, will need to be reviewed by Council, as well as the applicant. The EIR preparation timeline is uncertain. Typically the timeline is four to six months out once an agreement has been entered with a consultant.

Rob Pearson, Director of the City Housing Authority, reminded the Commission that the project was in response to the City's request for work-force housing. Increases in construction costs have resulted in the only way to make the project a reality is to have a percentage of market rate units. Twenty four units will be at market value. As the market continues to rise, this could be reduced to 18-20 units and result in contributing to affordable units. Without public subsidy funding available for this kind of project, it can only be done through higher density and creative land use decisions, such as off-site parking. Parking considerations have been extensive and the best solution is for on-street parking. Today, the only kind of affordable rental housing that is being built has to have some form of subsidizing. Negotiations have been set with Bermant Development for a fixed overhead and profit; any monies over that go back to the Housing Authority to do more affordable housing.

Rob Dayton asked for clarification from the Commission on parking. Noted Commission's consensus to meet all parking demand onsite, and requested clarification on the firmness of the position.

The Commissioners clarified that they would await analysis of the parking issue in the EIR before reaching a conclusion.

Commissioner Jostes called for a fifteen minute recess at 2:15 P.M. and reconvened at 2:30 P.M.

IV. RECOMMENDATION TO THE CITY COUNCIL:

ACTUAL TIME: 2:30 P.M.

**SINGLE FAMILY DESIGN GUIDELINES/NEIGHBORHOOD PRESERVATION
ORDINANCE DRAFT UPDATE Continued from June 1, 2006**

Recommendations to the City Council on the review and comment of the Single Family Design Guidelines/Neighborhood Preservation Ordinance Draft Update Package.

Case Planner: Heather Baker, Project Planner

Email: hbaker@SantaBarbaraCA.gov

Commissioner Jostes recapped that the Commission had met on this matter on June 1, 2006 and took a site tour on June 8th of various examples of home sizes.

Commissioner White commented on the quote given in the newspaper and taken out of context. He is respectful of the strong feelings held by the people who issued the flags.

Heather Baker, Project Planner, gave the Staff update, including presentation of a list of topics remaining to be discussed by the Commission.

Chair Jostes opened the public hearing at 2:34 P.M.

The following people spoke preferring that Floor/Area Ratio (FAR)s be implemented as guidelines:

1. Christine Pierron
2. Antonia Perez
3. Richard Box, would like to have seen greater public awareness
4. Karen Ellen, City Wide
5. Tom Reynolds

The following people spoke preferring that FARs be implemented as regulations; many stating that FAR maximums should be reduced to .38 at 6000 square feet:

1. Connie Hannah, approved of proposal with lower FAR standards.
2. Cathie McCammon, League of Women Voters and Mesa Home Owners Association
3. Naomi Kovacs, Executive Director, Citizens Planning Commission, expressed appreciation to Commission for its support on FAR standards and lot sizes.
4. Ellie Freese
5. Gil Barry
6. Dianne Channing
7. Paul Hernadi
8. Joe Guzzardi, also supported FARs to apply on lots up to 15,000 square feet.
9. Lee Moldaver
10. David Landecker
11. Steve Metsch, also supported FARs to apply on lots up to 15,000 square feet.
12. Inge Rose
13. Eric Schott, Marine Terrace Home Owners Association

The following people spoke on other NPO issues:

1. Bill Marks, approved of NPO, but only if FARs for lots up to 15,000 square feet.
2. Ginny Miller, would like FAR numbers raised.
3. Toby Bradley, Santa Barbara Association of Realtors, opposed to FARs.
4. Anita Ward, in a letter read by Toby Bradley, found proposed ordinance too restrictive.
5. Joe Andrulaitis, President, AIA, believed good design, not FARs, will preserve neighborhoods.
6. Bud Laurent, Coastal Housing Coalition, supports a flexible FAR.
7. Jeff Lovegreen
8. Hans Miller, would like to have seen meetings be more inclusive of working class families; does not support required FAR.
9. Lanny Ebenstein, supports greater FAR.

With no one else wishing to speak, the public hearing was closed at 3:36 P.M.

Ms. Baker read the names of three phone callers who called in support of the ordinance; Jerry Higgins, Margaret Quinby, and Stephanie Wilson; all supported FARs be implemented as standards.

Commissioner's questions and comments:

1. Asked Staff for more clarification on the FAR calculations.
2. Noted that proposed FARs are based on net square footage. Gross square footage would add about six percent.
3. Asked Staff to change the PowerPoint slide heading to include 85% maximum home size plus garage.
4. Asked Staff for other cities that were compared with Santa Barbara and whether they had regulations or guidelines. Stated that the ordinance does not carry much weight if the Building & Safety Department does not enforce approved plans.
5. Commented on a comparative survey done with other cities that revealed 70% had regulations; 30% had guidelines. FARs in other cities sometimes excluded garages or had generous modification processes.
6. Asked how the Building & Safety department would insure that the buildings are built according to the plans.

Jaime Limon, Senior Planner, used a PowerPoint slide to give more clarification on the FAR calculations. He explained the difference between .38 and .45 FARs as being a range between 85% to 100% and representing a difference of 400 square feet on a 6000 square foot lot.

Ms. Baker stated that local cities vary in FAR programs; some have regulations, others have guidelines. Goleta and Carpinteria have regulations; Montecito has guidelines.

Mr. Limon said that there has been improved communication and clear direction with building inspectors to better scrutinize projects and any field changes.

Commissioner's comments:

1. The Commission expressed appreciation for Staff's and the Committee's work on ordinance and the sampling of homes toured; appreciated public input.
2. Did not find summaries of board reviews in the Staff report. Felt that language should be stronger than "tips" for view preservation. All FARs not created equal, as was seen on tour. Good landscaping plans should be included in guidelines. Feels FAR should be a guideline and not a regulation. Would only change ordinance to apply FARs to lots up to 15,000 square feet.
3. The greatest neighborhood tension, approximately 90%, appeared to be on 4,000-8,000 square foot size lots. Tension mostly developed when a second story was added. Supports a regulation; less concerned with FAR than with second floor restrictions. Noted that covered porches, towers, and plate height are not included in the FARs, yet contribute to neighborhood tension. Suggested that the quality of materials be more scrutinized in design and enforcement.
4. Concerned with the Architectural Board of Review (ABR)'s workload that will be impacted by this ordinance. Some Commissioners expressed wanting to see more teeth in the guidelines.
5. Conveyed positive support for the proposed ordinance review after adoption.
6. Some of the homes toured were examples of homes that probably never went to ABR by having skirted around regulations. Commented that architects are not always involved in remodeling projects, which contributes to some of the poor design that was observed.
7. Expressed that the ordinance should apply to new development, not portions of unaltered existing homes.
8. Supported FAR regulations and suggested using gross figures. Supports FARs to apply up to 15,000 square foot lots.
9. Does not support FAR data to limit homeowners. Supports FARs as guidelines. Steering committee looked at many methods of limiting growth, FAR was one of them.
10. Feels that gross square footage is a more accurate measure of mass than net square footage. Suggested name change to Neighborhood Compatibility Ordinance. Acknowledged that public outreach has been extensive, however, comments received are still not representative of all neighborhoods.
11. Commissioners acknowledged the great work done by the ABR. Suggested that ordinance be given a three year trial, before becoming an ordinance.
12. Most Commissioners felt that it was bad design that is driving the ordinance. Felt that Staff needs to do a better job of educating applicants so that they do not return numerous times to the ABR.

13. Feels too much focus has been spent on size, and not in reviewing the other valuable components of the ordinance. Reiterated that there is no guarantee that an architect will be involved in a project. Supports regulations over guidelines.
14. Looks at remaining decision questions as a package. Suggested looking at regulation versus guideline first. Consensus of Commissioners suggested looking at the appeal process going directly to City Council and bypassing the Commission. Guidelines do not send as clear a message as regulations. The numbers represent the regulatory part; the guidelines represent the policy; feels more should be given on the FAR in exchange for a smaller second story. The three year review is best when used on regulations, not guidelines.

Ms. Baker stated that the reason that the Planning Commission was not shown on the chart was because the Planning Commission would not be reviewing Single Family Home projects at all; ABR would handle. If coastal permits or modifications are needed, then board reviews could be added, as a follow-up.

Bettie Weiss, City Planner, addressed the Good Neighbor Guidelines and Tips. Ms. Weiss stated that the steering committee's recommendation is in elevating the full set of good neighbor guidelines to a new finding at the ABR that at least asks that they be considered. Private view component was also discussed and will not be included in the general conformance with good neighbor policies.

Ms. Weiss stated that the decisions of the ABR should remain appealable to the City Council; the ABR is a charter commission appointed by the City Council and does not have a relationship with the Planning Commission where a decision made by the ABR can be changed by the Planning Commission.

MOTION: Mahan/White

Assigned Resolution No. 024-06

Recommend to City Council that 1) the FAR chart, with a maximum of 15,000 square foot lots, be made regulations; and 2) ABR appeals go directly to City Council; and 3) projects proposing modifications of over 100% of the maximum FAR go to the Planning Commission.

The Commissioner's discussed limiting FAR program to 10,000 square foot lots will not address many lots, and feels that it should be applicable up to 15,000 square foot lots.

This motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 4 Noes: 3 (Jacobs, Larson, Myers) Abstain: 0 Absent: 0

Commissioners Jacobs and Meyers support the appeal process, but not the regulatory aspect of the motion.

MOTION: White /Mahan

Assigned Resolution No. 024-06

Recommended that FAR numbers be measured in net square feet.

This motion carried by the following vote:

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

MOTION: Jacobs/Thompson

Assigned Resolution No. 024-06

Recommended that the ordinance be renamed the Neighborhood Compatibility Ordinance.

This motion carried by the following vote:

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

Discussion:

1. Does not want to rush to have a title change made.

Recommended that the plate of the tower should not exceed the plate of the second story, otherwise looks like an oversized chimney.

MOTION: Jacobs/Mahan

Assigned Resolution No. 024-06

Recommended that Staff study and send to Council a second floor FAR limitation of either 0.1 to 0.15 incorporated into the ordinance.

Discussion:

Agrees with concept, but does not feel enough information is available to make a decision.

This motion carried by the following vote:

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

MOTION: Myers/White

Assigned Resolution No. 024-06

Recommended a landscaping plan be required for houses that exceed 85% of maximum FAR.

This motion carried by the following vote:

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

MOTION: Mahan/Thompson

Assigned Resolution No. 024-06

Recommendation to Council for adoption of the guidelines and ordinance as amended, recognizing dissenting opinions on individual issues.

This motion carried by the following vote:

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

V. **DISCUSSION ITEM:**

ACTUAL TIME: 5:40 P.M.

APPLICATION OF JOHN SCHOOF, PRINCIPAL ENGINEER, AGENT FOR CITY OF SANTA BARBARA REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY, PROPERTY OWNER, 1221 ANACAPA STREET (GRANADA GARAGE), APN 039-184-034, C2 ZONE, GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: GENERAL COMMERCE/MAJOR PUBLIC INSTITUTIONAL (MSTt2003-00908). Continued to July 6, 2006

Discussion of the various options to address the lack of a designated right turn lane into the new Granada Garage at the Anapamu entrance.

Case Planner: Rob Dayton, Supervising Transportation Planner
Email: rdayton@SantaBarbaraCA.gov

John Schoof, Principal Engineer, gave the Staff presentation.

The Commissioner's asked Staff for a recommendation.

Mr. Schoof stated that it was seeking input from the Commission on which option to use.

Rob Dayton, Transportation Engineer, stated a concern over the loss of parking added; had been full time bike lanes and made a promise that the bike lane would be put back.

Chair Jostes opened the public hearing at 5:56 P.M.

The following people spoke:

1. Ralph Fertig, Santa Barbara Bicycle Coalition, spoke about concern for bikers riding to the biking station. Would like bicycle lanes reinstated.
2. Marshall Rose, Chairman, Downtown Parking Committee, asked for more dialogue and not rush to judgment over the options. Requests that que lane be given more consideration than the palm tree landscaping. It costs \$70,000/space in lost revenue.
3. Randy Rowse, Downtown Parking Committee, stated that whatever option is chosen, it will still take a while for the public to become aware of the Granada Garage.

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

The Commissioner's asked Mr. Rose to show a preferred option.

Mr. Rose preferred option 2 based on the transparencies.

Mr. Browning Allen, Transportation Manager, asked that the item be continued.

MOTION: Mahan/White

Continue item to June 6, 2006 with a site visit on Wednesday, June 5, 2006

This motion carried by the following vote:

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

Commissioner's comments and questions:

1. Asked if the County been contacted about losing parking spaces.
2. Asked if the parking is 75 minute parking; there are four to five 15 minute parking spaces.

Chair Jostes announced the ten calendar day appeal period.

VI. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

A. Committee and Liaison Reports.

None were given.

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.A.3. of this Agenda.

1. Draft minutes of May 4, 2006
2. Resolution 018-06
15 E. Islay Street
3. Draft minutes of May 11, 2006
4. Resolution 019-06
29 & 33 Soledad

MOTION: Mahan/Jacobs

Approve the minutes and resolutions as corrected.

This motion carried by the following vote:

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

Commissioner Larson abstained on all minutes and resolutions.

Commissioner White abstained on the minutes and resolution of May 4, 12006

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Jostes adjourned the meeting at 6:12 P.M.

Submitted by,

Julie Rodriguez, Planning Commission Secretary