



# City of Santa Barbara Planning Division

## PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

July 6, 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: Stella Larson, George C. Myers, Addison S. Thompson, and Harwood A. White, Jr.

Commissioner Larson arrived at 1:10 P.M.

Commissioner White arrived at 1:40 P.M.

Chair Jostes left at 4:04 P.M.

#### **Absent:**

Commissioner Bill Mahan

### **STAFF PRESENT:**

Browning Allen, Transportation Manager

Michael Berman, Environmental Analyst

Rob Dayton, Supervising Transportation Planner

Bill Ferguson, Water Resources Supervisor

Susan Gantz, Planning Technician II

Jan Hubbell, Senior Planner

JoAnne LaConte, Assistant Planner

John Schoof, Principal Engineer

N. Scott Vincent, Assistant City Attorney

Gabriela Feliciano, Commission Secretary

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

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

No requests were made.

B. Announcements and appeals.

Jan Hubbell, Senior Planner, made the following announcement:

A City Council appeal is scheduled at 6:00 p.m. on July 25, 2006, for 85 North La Cumbre.

Vice-Chair Jacobs volunteered to represent the Planning Commission at that appeal hearing.

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

Chair Jostes opened the public hearing at 1:04 P.M. With no one wishing to speak, the public hearing was closed at 1:04 P.M.

**II. CONSENT ITEM:**

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

**APPLICATION OF KIRK GRADIN, ARCHITECT FOR DENNIS CARLTON, PROPERTY OWNER, 910 CAMINO VIEJO, APN 015-060-046, A-2, SINGLE FAMILY ZONE, GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: RESIDENTIAL, TWO UNITS PER ACRE (MST2005-00344)**

The project involves the construction of a new approximately 5,305 net square foot, two-story single-family residence with an attached approximately 848 square foot garage and 400 square foot swimming pool on a 50,094 square foot vacant lot in the Hillside Design District. There is also grading associated with the project consisting of approximately 1,071 cubic yards of cut and 1,048 cubic yards of fill outside of the main building footprint.

The discretionary applications required for this project are:

1. Modification to allow the covered parking to have a total aggregate floor area in excess of 750 square feet (SBMC § 28.87.160.4); and
2. Neighborhood Preservation Ordinance Findings for grading in excess of 500 cubic yards outside the building footprint (SBMC § 22.68.070).

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

Case Planner: Susan Gantz, Planning Technician II

Email: SGantz@SantaBarbaraCA.gov

Jan Hubbell, Senior Planner, requested that the Planning Commission waive the Staff Report.

**MOTION: Myers/Thompson**

Waive the Staff Report.

This motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 4 Noes: 0 Abstain: 0 Absent: 3 (Larson/Mahan/White)

Chair Jostes opened the public hearing at 1:05 P.M. With no one wishing to speak, the public hearing was closed at 1:05 P.M.

Commissioners' comments and questions:

1. Stated that the size of the garage is consistent with the scale of the house and it being constructed mostly below grade is appropriate.
2. Asked if any of the grading is being moved off-site.
3. Observed that, regarding the Neighborhood Preservation Ordinance Findings, the project is very compatible with the houses in the neighborhood on all sides.

Susan Gantz, Case Planner, responded that all the grading is being balanced on-site with most of the cut from the upper portion of the site being used under the new driveway.

**MOTION: Jacobs/Thompson**

**Assigned Resolution No. 025-06**

Approve the project, making the findings for the modification and the Neighborhood Preservation Ordinance Findings, subject to the Conditions of Approval outlined in Exhibit A.

This motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 4 Noes: 0 Abstain: 0 Absent: 3 (Larson/Mahan/White)

Chair Jostes announced the ten calendar day appeal period.

Commissioner Larson arrived at 1:10 P.M.

**III. CONTINUED ITEM:**

**ACTUAL TIME: 1:12 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 (MST2003-00908).**

1. 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 regarding the garage entry design.

Commissioners' comments and questions:

1. Requested a discussion on the option to make the two lanes narrower and to restripe the street with a narrower right turn lane.

2. Asked if, when the gate on the opposite side of the Granada Garage entrance is open, it could be presumed that there would not be a similar problem for cars to exit on that particular stretch of Anapamu Street, and commented that the exit queuing will hopefully improve when that other lane is open.
3. Asked if there is any insurance to cover the cost of this project since it was an omission by the designer and commented that it would be a shame if City monies are use to cover correcting this mistake instead of using it for other worthy projects that are waiting to be done.
4. Asked if the signage is fully complete for the project, such as entrance and bike exit signs.
5. Asked if the Commission was to show a preference for the Staff Option, if it would be possible later on to expand the pocket to provide additional capacity should that capacity be found to not be enough to solve the problem to the satisfaction of both the City and the downtown merchants in this portion of the area.
6. Supported Option 2 as it made the most sense, and commented that the trees can be relocated or trees with a different canopy/root structure along the County side could be installed as an attractive solution.
7. Explained that any plan that takes away ADA accessibility would not be acceptable; therefore, Options 1 and 3 would not be appropriate.
8. The green curb on the County side should not be converted into a red curb, so that it is available to people with accessibility problems and for those with short errands at the County building.
9. Supported Option 4 as a strong second choice.
10. Emphasized that the thinking that went into the original design was best because it had room for everybody—it had parking, two lanes of traffic, and a turn lane—and hopes the design company will correcting its mistake.
11. Agreed that Option 2 is supportable, if a landscape plan can be put in place such that street trees are retained.
12. Supported Option 5 as a second choice because, although some of the on-street parking is lost, an attractive streetscape is retained and the Granada Garage's 570 parking spaces should make parking less of an issue than it would otherwise be.
13. Considered the Staff Option as a good middle ground, but it would injure the streetscape immediately in front of the Granada Garage and the much needed pedestrian street frontage would be carved away.
14. Agreed that Options 4 and 5 are good choices with the removal of parking on the County side of the street because there is often a conflict on Anacapa Street between a variety of ingress/egress and parking movements, and the passing traffic.
15. Critiqued that Anacapa Street is not a good bicycling street, yet there is an ingress ramp for bicycles that goes up and down on the Coffee Cat corner that does not allow bicyclists to navigate easily. It cannot be used for wheelchairs because it is too steep. If that ramp is to remain, a platform and some sort of signage or flaring at the curb need to be installed.
16. Proposed that the expansion of evening parking on the south side of Anapamu be considered as an option.

17. Stated that other resources such as the County lot and other spots that indicate “by permit only” at one time provided parking in the evening when the Granada lot was full. Something to consider is the northern end near Victoria to be made open for theatre parking.
18. Pointed out that the County has more demand for parking than there is supply.
19. Observed that there is a bulb-out heading up Chapala Street before arriving at Ralph’s that has been made into a taxi waiting area, which actually removes the advantage of the bulb-out and creates a hazard. Would like to make sure that, if there is a bulb-out on Anacapa Street, it is not made to shelter taxi cabs, so that it serves its purpose to calm traffic, not create a problem.
20. Stated that the public is not well served if there is no right lane turn and if the parking is eliminated, which points to Option 2 that eliminates the wider parkway on the County side, keeps the parking, and installs the right turn lane.
21. Agreed that the Staff Option would be the best second choice, which keeps the parking and gives at least a partial right turn lane.
22. Explained that the function of this Downtown Area has always had a special flavor in terms of its function, design, and its importance as a quality urban space.
23. Given the size and scale of the Granada Garage, would like to see that landscaping along the Anacapa Street corridor be maintained as much as possible.

Browning Allen responded that the concern with narrowing the lanes is the conflict with the cars parked on the County side of the street. There have been incidents of side swipe accidents, so that narrowing the lanes even more to add the right lane turn would increase the risk.

Mr. Schoof responded that the geometric handbook for designing streets calls on an urban collector for a minimum of a ten feet lane width. He also added that the Anapamu Street entrance will hold up to six or seven cars as a queuing pocket.

Mr. Vincent responded that the analysis is not complete in determining whether the designers or the City are liable for the mistake. He pointed out that neither the presence or lack of insurance would limit the company’s liability if it is ultimately determined that the designing company failed to provide the contracted “product.”

Mr. Schoof responded that signs are complete per that contract, but there are discussions of adding an additional parking sign to the structure to make it more visible to enter. He also stated that the possibility of expanding the pocket to get more cars in would be looked at during the design process. One of the limiting factors is that there is a driveway/*paseo* entrance on the opposite side.

Commissioner White arrived at 1:40 P.M.

2. Request by the Downtown Organization to provide on-street parking on the northerly side of the 00 block of West Anapamu Street and the southerly side of the 100 block of East Anapamu Street.

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

Rob Dayton, Supervising Transportation Planner, gave the Staff presentation.

Commissioners' questions and comments:

1. Asked for an explanation of the Downtown Organization's position, whether they are requesting a permanent change or to continue the temporary parking to allow this issue to be studied.
2. Asked if the stop signs and streetlights are also mitigating factors, acting as biking corridors, so that bikes do not have to compete with the on-coming traffic.
3. Asked for Staff's opinion on the Transportation and Circulation Committee's comment on night time parking.
4. Conveyed respect and support for the Historic Landmarks Commission's concerns about eliminating all parking in front of the Landmark.
5. Expressed support for a timed bike lane for student use and that it be narrow enough so that a person would not confuse it with a wheelchair lane.
6. Reminded that the City wants to encourage bike riding downtown and has made such a strong statement that there is even a flagship bike station on the corner of Anapamu and Anacapa Streets. There is an element of public trust that is important, in particular with a part of the community that is highly valued, namely, the bike riding population. The City promised that the on-street parking would be temporary and the bike lanes would be restored.
7. Felt that the surrounding businesses were aware that the on-street parking was temporary.
8. Encourages full time bike lines in the area because they are near the Civic Center and the library, they are on a school route, they are near the flagship of bike lockers and station, and they are centrally located (which is to say that Anapamu gives an important east-west direction that links the north-south connectors of Bath, Castillo, Anacapa, and Santa Barbara Streets).
9. Explained that the Master Bike Plan was correct, so that there is not only a need for full time bike lanes, but the integrity and commitment of the City's Staff needs to be maintained and honored.
10. Commented on the need for design review by people who ride bicycles for future amenities for bikes.
11. Asked how the bike lanes in these two blocks affect the changes taking place on the Anapamu Street area further west where bike lanes are being placed.
12. Asked for the lane width on the south side of the 00 block of Anapamu in front of the library, since the bike lane has been taken away, that would give a bicyclist an edge over traffic.
13. Encouraged creative approaches to delineate bicycle flow.

14. Stated that it is critical to maintain the full time bike lanes not only because of the promises that have been made in the past, but also because of the important priority that the City has given to balancing the variety of uses of our street system and the circulation element policy.
15. Stated that the issue can be reconsidered in the future if there is a compelling need to do things differently or if an opportunity is presented to make better use in terms of providing evening parking, and if it can be demonstrated that it is not a disincentive for bicycle use.

Mr. Dayton responded that the Downtown Organization is requesting that the temporary parking now be permanent with the exception of the school times for the bike lane. He added that the 1974 and 2002 master plans include the fact that bicyclists like to go where there are cars, so that those heavy traffic streets include bike lanes to give bicyclists comfort and a level of safety. There will be further conversations on how Anapamu evolves, which would probably include some time restrictions where parking would be allowed even where there are full time bike lanes.

Mr. Schoof responded that the improvements to the portion of Anapamu from De la Vina to the Anapamu bridge are designed to make it better for pedestrians, make the street slower and brighter, and more reasonable for bikes. There is comfortable accommodation for both bikes and cars at the stop signs. He added that it is a wide curb lane, wider than the standard vehicle lane, that can accommodate both bikes and vehicles reasonably. Signage could be added to indicate that sharing of the lanes could be expected.

Chair Jostes opened the public hearing at 1:53 P.M.

1. The following people spoke regarding the Granada Garage right turn queuing lane:  
Mr. Marshall Rose, Downtown Organization representative.  
Mr. Erik Kelley, representing The Book Den.  
Ms. Michael Self, president of Santa Barbara Safe Streets.  
Mr. Robert Ooley, County Architect.  
Mr. Jim Westby, Santa Barbara Safe Streets member.
2. The following people spoke in opposition to making the Anapamu Street parking permanent:  
Mr. Wilson Hubbell, Vice-President of the Santa Barbara County Bicycle Coalition.  
Mr. Ralph Fertig, President of Santa Barbara Bicycle Coalition.  
Mr. Robert Ooley, County Architect.  
  
The following people spoke in support of making the Anapamu Street parking permanent:  
Mr. Marshall Rose, Downtown Organization representative.  
Mr. Erik Kelley, representing The Book Den.  
Ms. Michael Self, president of Santa Barbara Safe Streets.  
Mr. Jim Westby, Santa Barbara Safe Streets member.

With no one else wishing to speak, the public hearing was closed at 2:19 P.M.

**MOTION: Jacobs/White**

**Assigned Resolution No. 026-06**

Direct the following recommendations to City Council:

1. Regarding the right turn lane into the new Granada Garage at the Anapamu entrance, the Commission is in support of Option 2 with an additional recommendation that there be a landscape plan; the second choice is in favor of Option 4, if financing becomes a substantial issue; and the Staff Option is the third alternative.

**Assigned Resolution No. 027-06**

2. The bicycle lanes on the 00 West and 100 East blocks of Anapamu Street should be returned to the way they were before the (Granada Garage) project began, to be implemented immediately.

This motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 5 Noes: 1 (Myers) Abstain: 0 Absent: 1 (Mahan)

**IV. NEW ITEMS:**

**A. ACTUAL TIME: 2:55 P.M.**

**APPLICATION OF BILL FERGUSON WATER RESOURCES SUPERVISOR FOR CITY OF SANTA BARBARA, 520 AND 525 E. YANONALI, APN 017-540-007, OM-1 ZONE, GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: INDUSTRIAL (MST06-00290/CDP06-00010)**

The proposed project involves an amendment to the proposed project and conditions of approval to include contribution to the City's Underground Utility Fund in lieu of undergrounding 600 feet of electrical transmission lines.

The discretionary application required for this project is a Coastal Development Permit (CDP2005-00010) to allow the proposed development in the Appealable Jurisdiction of the City's Coastal Zone (SBMC §28.45.009).

The Environmental Analyst has determined that the change in the project description and conditions of approval would not result in a significant environmental impact since the funds that would have been used to underground utilities in the industrial area would be used to underground utilities that would have a more beneficial effect on visual resources elsewhere in the Coastal Zone. This has been documented in an Addendum to the Final Environmental Impact Report prepared for this project.

Case Planner: Michael Berman, Environmental Analyst  
Email: mberman@SantaBarbaraCA.gov

Michael Berman, Case Planner, gave the Staff presentation.

Mr. Berman introduced Bill Ferguson, Water Resource Supervisor; Homer Smith, Principal Engineer; and indicated that a Southern California Edison (SCE) representative was present.

Commissioners' questions and comments:

1. Asked if transferring the monies to the undergrounding utility fund is only a theory or if indeed it would be used to offset funds that City Council approved (to be used for the undergrounding on Cliff Drive) with the \$375,000 allocated for this project.

2. Stated that there appears to be a misunderstanding since the beginning when the desal plant went from an emergency to a permanent facility. The transmission line that was built for this project was meant to supply energy to the facility. Planning Staff had been requested to provide photographs of these lines showing they go over Highway 101. They are not in the spirit of Santa Barbara and need to go underground. The Commission's intent in voting for this project was that the wires crossing Highway 101 would go underground.
3. Understood that the conditions of approval only reflected the lines on Yanonali. Agreed with the recommendation that the lines on Yanonali should not go underground and the other lines built for this project that begin at Montecito Street should be above ground. The cost of undergrounding those lines would be in the millions. Yet, pointed out that in the Highway 101 widening project many wires will be undergrounded. Would like to see if it would be a realistic opportunity to assess whether the lines crossing Highway 101 are a significant adverse impact and then make a decision as to what can be done about it. Apologized to the staff in the water agency and the Planning Division Staff for not clarifying what was being requested previously when they were asked to provide more information.
4. Pointed out that the past Planning Commission minutes should reflect that there were two poles, one on Yanonali and the other on Quarantina. It may be that the realities of the costs may lead the Commission to not take any action relating to the lines crossing Highway 101, but it remains to be seen.
5. Stated that the views that were presented in the photographs showing the freeway and other vantage points coming north on highway 101 indicate an industrial area with visible wires. That is a significant issue. Yet, recognizes that the City cannot underground the wiring and would not be able to afford it anyway; therefore, can support the trade-off of taking this money and putting it elsewhere. Recommends taking the monies and putting them at the head of the Cliff Drive project. Would like to see finite numbers applied to a specific project and be able to approve around those numbers. Then take whatever is left over to use for another project. Maybe that would be the beginning of getting rid of the overhead wires crossing Highway 101.
6. Asked how the Commission can begin addressing undergrounding the wires that cross the freeway.
7. Explained that it was an emergency to place the wiring above ground when the project was approved. A developer would not have been allowed to construct above ground power lines. The water agency is a unique funding source as it has the ability to raise the funds to do projects such as undergrounding. The funding is there, so that it would not be robbing community resources to do the undergrounding. The problem needs to be framed to see whether it warrants this sacrifice, considering that it would be costly.
8. Agreed that, if getting the wires across Highway 101 undergrounded was considered a mitigation to a significant impact, it gets a higher degree of attention in terms of mitigation and should be considered separately from whatever standard community-wide mitigations take place. More information is needed in order to make a determination.
9. Proposed that this issue be reviewed again and if it is found to constitute a significant adverse impact, then the query can be sent to City Council for guidance as to how the issue can be dealt with.
10. Believed that this is an opportunity to look at the possibility of changing the environment since, as the line crosses Highway 101 to the north, it enters an area that is in transition for residential use. There is a large proposal for housing across from *Casa de la Raza*. This may be a catalyst for that change.

11. Established that it is premature to ask for the \$375, 000 to be moved to a different fund. The Commission has emphasized that the City needs to be held by the same standards to which a private developer would be held. Among the information needed would be to make a true study of what it would cost to underground the wiring that cross Highway 101. Was this a mitigation for the permanent desalination plant? If so, are we meeting the intent of that mitigation with Staff's proposed action? Where did the \$375,000 number come from? Clearly that is not enough money to get the lines underground. The following needs to be done: a) Direction from City Council on how to proceed with this project, or b) Staff needs to be directed to make further study of what it would take to underground the 101 wires; and if that was the original intent, whether or not that is an action that could be seen as a mitigation for the permanent desalination plant.
12. Suggested that another piece of useful information would be the minutes from the Planning Commission meeting that certifies the EIR. Requested that the final EIR and information regarding all discussions about the wires over Highway 101 be provided by Staff.
13. Looked at this project as two separate issues, so that the Commission could probably approve the one presently proposed by Staff and recommend further study of the Highway 101 overhead wires.
14. Agreed that the findings should be made as outlined by Staff. It is a smarter use of funds to put those monies towards something more visual in the coastal zone. Yet, is concerned that, if the monies were to be put in a "lockbox" for implementation, they be used specifically for coastal zone projects and that they not be used to expedite the Cliff Drive project. Although Mission Street seems like a very important project to undertake, there already is a project that has been approved and is on its way toward implementation at the Cliff/Meigs intersection. The focus has been to continue on that project. Therefore, this is separate money that would be used for undergrounding in the Coastal Zone area.
15. Understood that the \$375,000 is a floor and not a ceiling, but requested more details.
16. Asked if there is a time-critical decision that needs to be made immediately. If not, both issues can be dealt with as a package.
17. Asked how project money can get funneled into undergrounding utility money and if there is a conflict.

Mr. Berman responded that the \$375,000 is the minimum that would be provided. They are the remaining funds that were allocated for undergrounding, some of which have already been spent on facility planning, and to provide an estimate of the costs of undergrounding.

Mr. Smith stated that, when there was a discussion in early May about undergrounding on Cliff Drive, it was explained that Southern California Edison (SCE) provides a rough estimate of about \$1.5 million dollars per city block for undergrounding *distribution* lines. SCE, as a rule, does not underground transmission lines. Transmission lines use a completely different set of standards, a much higher criteria, it has to be buried in insulated conduit, has to be at least five feet from any sewer, water, and other utility line. This project is essentially ten years old, so that the \$375,000 estimate is probably inadequate to accomplish this project.

Ms. Hubbell stated that the \$375,000 is "real money." Staff would be concerned that, in the process of moving these monies to the undergrounding fund, the funds that have been made for the first priority are not lost and that the additional money may be used to extend the distance as was recommended to City Council.

Mr. Smith added that, as of July 1, 2006, the special undergrounding Fund 148 was established, which are monies received from the ½% surcharge on the SCE franchise fee that is dedicated towards undergrounding. It accrues at around \$300,000 a year, based upon the SCE franchise agreement. The monies from the Water Resources Fund would be moved into the undergrounding fund; it would then be “fenced” and could not be used for any other purpose. When the Rule 20A undergrounding project was presented in May and the recommendation was made for Cliff Drive, the Commission requested to try to extend it as far as possible. A retired SCE planner was hired to refine the cost estimate. It was found that the undergrounding can now go all the way down to Mesa Lane within the original project size of \$3.5 to \$4.5 million dollars. They had been presented as two separate projects, but can now be done as one. The final cost of the project will be known when SCE completes its estimate in 18 to 24 months. To consider “parking” the SCE 20A \$375,000 somewhere else for the three to four years that it may take to accrue for another substantial 20A project, the \$375,000 would probably be eroded due to the significant construction cost increases. Applying the monies to the Coastal Zone, along Cliff Drive, would maximize the effectiveness of the money. If there are still funds left over, the project would extend the underground district further to the east to include residential areas on Cliff Drive.

Mr. Ferguson responded that the transmission lines go over the freeway and were built to serve the desalination plant and El Estero Wastewater Treatment Plant that was added on. There are distribution lines across the freeway in the photographs shown in the presentation that indicate that there are a series of lines starting at the corner of Calle César Chávez and Yanonali Street going northward across the freeway up along Calle César Chávez. The top three lines are the transmission lines, the center ones are the distribution lines, and the bottom ones are telephone communication lines.

Ms. Hubbell reviewed the final EIR for the long-term water supply program, which incorporated the permanent desalination plant as part of it. The project description says that the proposal of the long-term water supply program was to convert the temporary plant to a permanent facility. Power lines to the substation (located on Yanonali Street on the El Estero side) would be placed underground from the point where they diverged from preexisting overhead power lines approximately 250 feet west of the intersection of Yanonali and Salsipuedes Streets. Power lines from the substation to the desalination facility were installed underground during construction of the facility and would remain underground. There is no reference of the distribution lines going across US101 in the plans or in the EIR.

Mr. Ferguson responded that the Commission may look at this issue of the wiring over the freeway as part of its priority process and may put it on the top of its list after the Cliff and Mission projects are taken care of.

Ms. Hubbell quoted from the Environmental Setting under Aesthetics and Visuals for the long-term water supply EIR. The EIR acknowledged that what was needed for mitigation was only the undergrounding of the lines along Yanonali Street. At least from the environmental standpoint, at the time the project became permanent, there is no outstanding impact in terms of CEQA. Staff acknowledges that having lines crossing Highway 101 is certainly some kind of a visual impact, but they existed prior to the project. What the desalination plant did was add to those existing lines. The conclusion may have been that, since the lines were already there, the addition of transmission lines did not rise to a level of significance and the policy issue was addressed by undergrounding those lines around Yanonali Street.

Ms. Hubbell suggested that, with several outstanding questions, the project be continued for Staff to research relevant sections of the minutes, and the original EIR.

Mr. Ferguson responded that the total amount, including contingencies, was about \$490,000. Some of that money was in addition to the remaining available funding for this project. In order to fund this project, other projects would have had to be curtailed. The current balance in the project account is about \$412,000. There are outstanding costs with SCE for work they have done on the project over the course of the years and costs for the current process. The target is that the ending balance would be about \$375,000. The plan was to dedicate any remaining funds in that project account, not less than the remaining \$375,000, to alternate undergrounding projects.

Mr. Vincent responded that this project is similar to a solution that the Planning Commission concluded with another applicant where there was a condition regarding the installation of a sidewalk in connection with a single-family remodel on a block that did not have sidewalks. The applicant sought an alternative solution to that condition that made more sense. The Planning Commission determined that it met the original goal of the condition, which was to foster greater mobility and approve sidewalk connectivity. The Water Department is proposing with this project an alternate use of the money intended to respond to a mitigation for a project that was built. The scope of that condition is specified in the condition of approval. The Water Department is proposing taking the dollar amount that would go toward the cost of taking three poles down and use the monies for six or seven poles of distribution lines.

Chair Jostes opened the public hearing at 3:12 P.M. With no one wishing to speak, the public hearing was closed at 3:12 P.M.

**MOTION: White/Myers**

Continued two weeks for Staff to review the 1996 Planning Commission minutes and see if there was more discussion about this matter with a decision pending that research. The following shall be included: 1) The 1991 and 1995 Planning Commission Resolutions, if pertinent. 2) Planning Commission minutes relating to any poles on Salsipuedes (which is now Calle César Chávez). 3) Project descriptions and aesthetic sections of both the temporary desalination and the long-term Water Supply Program EIRs. 4) 1995 and 1996 Staff Reports, including any exhibits that may relate. 5) Summary of how the amount of \$375,000 was calculated.

This motion carried by the following vote:

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

Chair Jostes announced a break at 4:04 PM.

Chair Jostes left at 4:04 P.M.

Pro tem Chair Jacobs reconvened the meeting at 4:25 P.M.

**B. ACTUAL TIME: 4:25 P.M.**

**APPLICATION OF MARK AND JACQUELYN BOYD, PROPERTY OWNERS, 1380 SHORELINE DRIVE, 045-193-018, E-3/SD-3 ZONES, GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: RESIDENTIAL FIVE UNITS PER ACRE (MST2004-00873)**

The project consists of approximately 992 square feet of first and second-story additions and a new attached 400 square foot garage to an existing 999 square foot single-family residence with an attached two-car garage on a 6,190 square foot lot. The proposal includes removal of 97 square feet from the existing residence and garage and conversion of 341 square feet of garage to habitable space with a new window in the required front yard setback and associated improvements. The project is located in the Appealable Jurisdiction of the Coastal Zone.

The discretionary applications required for this project are:

1. A Modification to allow an intensification of use and alterations within the required front yard setback in the E-3 Zone (SBMC §28.15.060.1 & SBMC §28.92.100.A); and
2. A Coastal Development Permit (CDP2005-00011) to allow the proposed development in the Appealable Jurisdiction of the City's 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 Section 15301.

Case Planner: Jo Anne Le Conte, Assistant Planner

Email: JLaConte@SantaBarbaraCA.gov

JoAnne LaConte, Assistant Planner, gave the Staff presentation.

Staff received a phone call from Richard and Susan Frye, neighbors at 1360 Shoreline Drive, advising that they have reviewed the plans and support the project.

Mark Boyd, owner, gave the applicant presentation.

Commissioners' questions and comments:

1. Asked if the applicant spoke to the neighbors and their proximity to the project.
2. Asked which windows are actually being proposed on the elevations, since in the proposed garage elevations there are three windows shown, but on the first-floor plans there is only one window shown with two entry doors in addition to the garage door.
3. Expressed initial concern with the long driveway and having to back out on to Shoreline Drive, but now sees it was well thought-out and supports having the garage off the street.
4. Stated where the west side deck lies in its relationship to the neighbor's house works well to protect their privacy.
5. Observed that the design is simple, looks good, is compatible with the neighborhood, and modest although large in comparison with the size of the lot.
6. Supported the project although concerned with the west side deck and what will happen when the house next door also proposes a second story.
7. Stated that the discrepancy in the garage plans needs to be addressed.

8. Was not convinced that it would be good to introduce a modification that advances living space closer to the street.
9. Was not concerned with the privacy issues since older parts of town have homes with windows that face each other and window coverings can be used.
10. Suggested sending the project back to the Architectural Board of Review to see if the front windows can be broken-up.
11. Supports the modification, from a land use standpoint, as an appropriate way to make the most of the existing house.
12. Expressed appreciation towards the applicant for incorporating good neighbor practices into the design, and Staff for including the FAR in the report.
13. Did not support granting the front yard modification because encroaching into the front yard is inappropriate.
14. Suggested that, given the amount of effort put into the redesign of the house, it be reviewed to see if some portion of the project can be shaved-off to bring it into compliance with the zoning and setback requirements.

Mr. Boyd responded that the neighbor to the west, where the driveway would exist to access the new garage, is supportive of the improvements. Neighbor is at a distance of about 24 feet. The neighbors on the east side are the closest to the project property and have given consent to the second story addition. The intent was to make as few windows as possible on the east side so that there would not be a privacy issue.

The elevations show the correct amount of windows, and the plans are correct showing a one man-door on the back and one to the side of the garage.

Ms. Hubbell responded that the change from garage to living space is already encroaching into the front yard.

Vice-Chair Jacobs opened the public hearing at 4:43 P.M. With no one wishing to speak, the public hearing was closed at 4:43 P.M.

**STRAW VOTE:**

Grant the Modification to allow intensification of use into the required front yard setback.

Ayes: 3 Noes: 2 (Jacobs, Larson) Abstain: 0 Absent: 2 (Jostes/Mahan)

**MOTION: Myers/Thompson**

**Assigned Resolution No. 028-06**

Approve the project and the front yard modification, making the findings and subject to the conditions outlined in the Staff Report, with the following additional conditions: The plan discrepancies shall be corrected and the project shall return to Architectural Board of Review (ABR) with a consistent set of drawings to receive design approval and Neighborhood Preservation Ordinance (NPO) findings; specifically, the one window version of the garage as approved by this Commission. The ABR should look for a more charming detail on the front elevation.

This motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 5 Noes: 0 Abstain: 0 Absent: 2 (Jostes/Mahan)

Pro tem Chair Jacobs announced the ten calendar day appeal period.

**V. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA**

A. Committee and Liaison Reports.

Commissioner Jacobs pointed out that the in-house Upcoming Staff Hearing Officer (SHO) Agenda Items has a secondary part listing the Pending List and it gives a one-sentence description of the matter pending to be presented before the Staff Hearing Officer. Since that one-sentence description is helpful in reading the calendar, it was requested that the one-sentence description be included in the SHO Agenda when an item is scheduled.

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

Commissioner White requested the Planning Commission have a conversation regarding 421 East Figueroa Street. It appears to be a mansionization project and would like to have at least an 8½ x 11 drawings and an on-screen presentation to discuss.

C. Action on the review and consideration of the following Planning Commission Minutes and Resolutions:

1. Minutes of May 18, 2006
2. Resolution 020-06 - General Plan Amendment
3. Minutes of June 1, 2006
4. Resolution 021-06 – 1009 Del Sol Avenue
5. Resolution 022-06 – 85 N. La Cumbre Road

**MOTION: Myers/Larson**

Approve the minutes and resolutions as corrected.

This motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 5 Noes: 0 Abstain: 0 Absent: 2 (Jostes/Mahan)

**VI. ADJOURNMENT**

Pro-tem Chair Jacobs adjourned the meeting at 5:05 P.M.

Submitted by,

---

Gabriela Feliciano, Commission Secretary