



City of Santa Barbara Planning Division

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

September 14, 2006

CALL TO ORDER:

Chair John Jostes called the meeting to order at 1:03 P.M.

ROLL CALL:

Present:

Chair John Jostes

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

Vice-Chair Jacobs arrived at 1:15 P.M.

Absent:

Commissioners Stella Larson and Harwood A. White, Jr.

STAFF PRESENT:

Bettie Weiss, City Planner

Jan Hubbell, Senior Planner

Frank Mannix, Police Captain

Browning Allen, Transportation Manager

Rob Dayton, Principal Transportation Planner

Susan Gray, Community Development Programs Supervisor

Kathleen Kennedy, Associate Planner

Irma Unzueta, Project Planner

Barbara Shelton, Environmental Analyst

Steven P. Wiley, City Attorney

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.

Ms. Hubbell made the following announcements:

1. The 517 Chapala Street appeal has been withdrawn. The neighbors and architects met and worked out design changes that will be taken to the Historic Landmarks Commission to further reduce the height of the project.
2. There will be a joint meeting of City Council and the Planning Commission next Tuesday, September 19, 2006, from 9 a.m. to 12 p.m.
3. The City Council hearing for Veronica Meadows will be held on October 3, 2006, and a Planning Commission representative will need to attend.

Mr. Mahan announced that he and Mr. White will be present.

4. The 40 Pine Drive appeal will be heard by City Council on October 24, 2006, and a Planning Commission representative will need to attend.

Mr. Jostes and Mr. Myers agreed to be present.

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

II. CONSENT ITEM:

ACTUAL TIME: 1:05 P.M.

APPLICATION OF STEVE MORANDO, AGENT FOR CAROLYN NIELSEN, PROPERTY OWNER, 295 SANTA MONICA DRIVE, APN 045-092-005, E-3/SD-3, ONE FAMILY RESIDENCE AND COASTAL OVERLAY ZONES, GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: RESIDENTIAL, FIVE UNITS/ACRE, (MST2006-00336)

The project consists of a proposal for a new 84 square foot bathroom addition to an existing 1,296 square foot single family residence with an attached two car garage on a 6,049 square foot lot.

The discretionary application required for this project is a Coastal Development Permit to allow development 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 Section 15301 (Existing Facilities).

Case Planner: Kathleen Kennedy, Associate Planner
Email: kkennedy@SantaBarbaraCA.gov

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

MOTION: Mahan/Thompson

Waive the Staff Report.

This motion carried by the following vote:

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

Carolyn Nielsen, property owner, gave the applicant presentation.

Chair Jostes opened the public hearing at 1:07 P.M. With no one wishing to speak, the public hearing was closed at 1:07 P.M.

MOTION: Mahan/Myers

Assigned Resolution No. 038-06

Approved the project as submitted, making the findings for the Coastal Development Permit, and subject to the Conditions of Approval.

This motion carried by the following vote:

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

Chair Jostes announced the ten calendar day appeal period.

III. DISCUSSION ITEM:

ACTUAL TIME: 1:08 P.M.

APPLICATION OF DAVE TABOR, AGENT FOR CASA ESPERANZA, PROPERTY OWNER, 816 CACIQUE STREET AND 110 SOUTH QUARANTINA STREET, APNs 017-240-021 & 017-240-034, M-1, LIGHT MANUFACTURING, C-2, GENERAL COMMERCE AND S-D-3, COASTAL OVERLAY ZONES, GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: INDUSTRIAL (MST99-00432)

The Planning Commission considered and approved amendments to the Conditional Use Permit, the Parking Modification, and the Coastal Development Permit for Casa Esperanza to increase the parking spaces and clarify the program elements on November 18, 2004. A progress report on condition compliance is required every two years after an initial six-month report heard on June 9, 2005, although the Commission may require interim reports. At the hearing in 2005, the Planning Commission requested an interim report in 2006.

No formal action on the project will be taken during this discussion item.

Case Planner: Jan Hubbell, Senior Planner
Email: jhubbell@SantaBarbaraCA.gov

Jan Hubbell, Senior Planner, gave the Staff presentation and introduced Frank Mannix, Police Captain; Browning Allen, Transportation Manager; Mike Foley, Executive Director of Casa Esperanza; Gary Linker, Chair of Milpas Action Task Force; Bob Ludwig, The Milpas Association; Susan Gray, Community Development Programs Supervisor.

Commissioner Jacobs arrived at 1:15 P.M.

Commissioners' comments and questions:

1. Asked for the proportion of increase in homeless population.
2. Asked if the increase in crime can be attributed to Casa Esperanza becoming a magnet for people that commit those crimes.
3. Asked if there is data indicating the percentage of residents that are perpetrators of various crimes in the neighborhood.
4. Asked if a correlation has been identified in the data collected with the City's recent collaboration with Amtrak to sweep the train track areas and if that is driving transients into the shelter area.
5. Requested further insight to help the Planning Commission identify trends within the City or the broader south coast urban environment.
6. Asked if able to track and measure the effect of maintenance and clean-up on the creek water quality and if there is coordination with the Creeks Program.
7. Asked if there has been a program to encourage merchants to install deterring devices on shopping carts to discourage removal so that the City does not have to pay the expense of locating carts.
8. Asked what percentage of the budget is dedicated for ancillary homeless issues.
9. Asked if Casa Esperanza has anecdotal reasons for the increase in arrests for various crimes and if it is working with the Police Department to alleviate the problem.
10. Asked what happens to those individuals that are denied access to the shelter and what should ideally happen to those individuals.
11. There was a consensus in expressing appreciation for such an emphatic approach to a difficult situation and for looking at the causes of homelessness to resolve what can be done to resolve them.
12. Requested details about membership points meant to reward good behavior.
13. Asked how chronic inebriates are identified and how their basic human rights are maintained.
14. Asked what authority the City has to control the distribution of alcohol locally.
15. Stated that the City was not aware of the impact ramifications to the area when a site was chosen for Casa Esperanza, but the City is now learning from the experience. Commented that it would be worth while to consider pursuing an overlay zone that would control the sale of alcohol within a radius of a homeless shelter. That would be a step in the right direction so that, when existing businesses want to remodel, the City would have some leverage to begin making changes.
16. Acknowledged that there are too many unfunded mandates, but stated that resources are the key to move this problem towards a resolution.
17. Stated that, although there are limited abilities to control the sales of alcohol, the City does have the ability to control consumption by making a person who drinks around a homeless shelter subject to a citation or arrest.
18. Requested that the Commission continue receiving reports about the SRO on Carrillo that will soon open, including the progress of the enrollment program, with the goal of creating a final process to make that project work.
19. Harkened back to the Commission's role in granting the Conditional Use Permit.

20. Stated that community problems that span organizational boundaries compel integrated and coordinated types of solutions as well as public partnerships, which result in assisting the Commission in its decision-making.
21. Observed that, in approaching the underlying causes of homelessness, the element of bureaucracy is not being seen.

Frank Mannix, Police Captain, explained that it is difficult for the police department to collect the data to calculate the specific increase in homelessness, but an indicator is the steady increase over the past several years of people who use “transient” as an address. He added that patrol officers report that, since Casa Esperanza has been put in place, there has been an overall increase in neighborhood activity. The offense and arrest data support that analysis, indicating that the crime increase has been in the areas typically associated with homelessness.

Mr. Mannix stated that, although it is difficult to quantify the benefits of the Casa Esperanza service to the homeless population, the shelter is located in a good area within the City. Many of the homeless problems are seasonable, especially during the winter months, and the inevitable consequence is that transients will congregate in the surroundings of the shelter.

Mr. Mannix responded that the offense and arrest data would be unable to differentiate between residents and transients because it does not take into consideration where a perpetrator lives. He added that transients travel the paths where they are less likely to be contacted by the police. It could be that, as the police become more successful in knocking down transient camps, the appropriate place for the homeless to go is the shelter, but it is difficult to quantify whether Amtrak’s sweeping of the train tracks has any correlation with the increase of transients in the shelter area.

Mr. Mannix stated that it is the general belief among police officers that Santa Barbara is a wonderful place to be homeless, so that the City is left with the reality of managing the problem and the solution tends to be outside of its ability.

Browning Allen, Transportation Manager, stated that it is difficult to quantify the effect of maintenance and clean-up on the creek’s water quality because it is not being tested. The Parks Division does provide a crew to assist, but most of the trash being cleaned-up is not adjacent to a creek. He added that Vons and Ralph’s are participants in the shopping cart retrieval program and Scolari’s as well as other merchants are taking part in discussions to alleviate the problem.

Mr. Allen stated that four clean-ups in the Union Pacific area are budgeted yearly, representing around \$150, 000 out of the \$5 million street maintenance budget. Special clean-ups are also done at the request of the Police Department.

Mike Foley, Executive Director of Casa Esperanza, stated that the report presented by Casa Esperanza encouraged all efforts to increase the number of police officers and to pay them more. He noted that the narcotics squad consists of a total of five police officers although there is a huge drug problem in the City and encouraged tripling the number of narcotics officers.

Mr. Foley stated that the dispatch calls statistics received from police representatives at the Mission/Milpas Task Force through March 2006 seemed to conflict with the information presented to the Planning Commission by the Police Department. The statistics received by the Mission/Milpas Task Force show that the overall dispatch calls received for various crimes have decreased from quarter to quarter.

Mr. Mannix responded that the calls-for-service data is generated by information that the police dispatch operators collect from the public. There was a programming error found in the collection of that data that resulted in calls for service data being measured as the total number of squad cars that responded to a problem, but it has been corrected to only measure each incident individually. As a result, the calls for service data showed an overall decline.

Mr. Foley explained that the drug and alcohol concerns can be confronted with new environmental responses. There is an alcohol selling outlet at almost every block on Milpas Street. What is found from south central Los Angeles to Washington D.C. is that when there is a high level of concentration of liquor stores, alcoholics are attracted to those areas. The Casa Esperanza staff has worked to provide reporting of drug sellers that have led to significant arrests and continues to cooperate with the local police, but the Police Department is facing a shortage of staff. There use to be six Beat Coordinators that worked with Casa Esperanza that have now been reassigned to work on the streets. Captain Mannix has begun attending Mission/Milpas Task Force meetings to provide police representation.

Mr. Foley stated that what makes Casa Esperanza different from other shelters is that people with current drug/alcohol problems are given the opportunity to be successful, but they are required to behave themselves in order to stay in the shelter. When they do not behave, they are given a pathway to solve their problem in order to earn their way back into the shelter and they are encouraged to enter into a recovery program. He reported that Casa Esperanza recently created an "anti-program" program for transients that have failed in other drug treatment programs and provides incentives for participants who have done positive work, including providing them with phone cards in various amounts. He also commented that there would be a greater impact if more resources were received to help those that are addicted and by tripling the level of effort towards those that sell illegal drugs.

Mr. Foley explained that other communities have come up with a very specific definition of what a chronic inebriate is, and inform liquor stores not to sell alcohol to them. That is symbolic of Casa Esperanza's broader effort of creatively coming up with as many environmental solutions as possible. The police have also instituted a restorative policing program for the most chronically homeless people, so that there is a social services direct police connection. Mr. Mannix added that the Police Department and the District Attorney's office have a chronic offender program in place for inebriates that, if arrested 10 times within a 12 month period, are given a 180-day sentence at the County Jail that gives them a considerable "dry out" period.

Ms. Hubbell stated that the City's authority over the distribution of alcohol is limited because it is generally handled at the State level, but zoning is one particular tool that could be used. Mr. Vincent added that, although the sale and distribution of alcohol is controlled by State constitution, the zoning of the *location* of merchants that sell alcohol is left to local jurisdictions. The complicated factor on Milpas Street is that the locations that sell alcohol

are already in existence and if the City was to create a conditional permit requirement it would simply make existing locations non-conforming, but they would continue operating and selling alcohol.

Ms. Hubbell stated that the next report is scheduled to be presented to the Planning Commission in two years.

Chair Jostes announced a recess at 2:29 P.M. and reconvened at 2:59 P.M.

IV. NEW ITEM:

ACTUAL TIME: 2:59 P.M.

APPLICATION OF KEN MARSHALL FOR SANTA BARBARA COTTAGE HOSPITAL FOUNDATION, 601 E. MICHELTORANA STREET, 027-270-016, -17, -18, -19 AND -30,C-0, MEDICAL OFFICE AND R-2, TWO FAMILY RESIDENCE ZONES, GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: MAJOR PUBLIC AND INSTITUTIONAL/MEDICAL CENTER AND RESIDENTIAL 12 UNITS/ACRE (MST2003-00827)

The proposed Santa Barbara Cottage Hospital Foundation Workforce Housing Project would remove the existing St. Francis Hospital complex, including the main hospital, convent, central plant, and other ancillary structures, totaling approximately 189,000 square feet, and replace them with 115 residential condominiums that would cover 5.94 acres of the 7.39 acre site. The proposed mix of residential unit types is as follows: 10 one-bedroom units (approximately 655-810 square feet), 67 two-bedroom units (approximately 990 square feet), and 38 three bedroom units (approximately 1,150 – 1,340 square feet each). 81 of the units (70%) would be sold to Cottage Hospital employees at prices within the City's structure for affordable units and 34 units (30%) would be sold at market rates. Within the remaining 1.45 acres, the existing elderly care facility, Villa Riviera, would remain, but the parcel containing it would be adjusted to a size of approximately 31,500 square feet. The remaining lands zoned R-2, Two Family Residential, would be re-configured into three (3) lots of approximately 10,500 square feet each and the two existing residences on these R-2 parcels would remain. Although these R-2 lots have the potential for two residences on each lot, for a total of six residences, no development is proposed as part of this application.

Parking for the proposed Workforce Housing Project would be provided in accordance with Zoning Ordinance parking requirements. A total of 11 spaces would continue to be provided for the Villa Riviera facility and 254 parking spaces would be provided for the 115 proposed condominium units. As part of an existing shared-parking agreement six spaces would be provide for the adjacent office building located at 532 and 536 Arrellaga. Vehicular access to the three reconfigured R-2 parcels would be provided directly from Grand Avenue. Primary vehicular access to the Villa Riviera and to guest parking for this facility would continue to be provided from an existing private driveway connecting to the terminus of Arrellaga Street; existing secondary access to the facility from Grand Avenue would also be maintained. Internal vehicular circulation for the new residential

development would be provided by a system of private drives and improvements to Salsipuedes Street connecting to Micheltorena and Arrellaga.

The discretionary applications required for this project are:

1. A Tentative Subdivision Map to allow the creation of five lots (SBMC Chapters 27.07 and 27.13);
2. A Tentative Subdivision Map for a one-lot subdivision to create 115 residential condominium units (SBMC Chapters 27.07 and 27.13);
3. A Modification of lot area requirements to allow forty-two (42) bonus density residential condominium units (SBMC §28.21.080.E.);
4. A Modification to allow less than the required separation between buildings for twenty-one (21) of the forty-eight (48) buildings proposed (SBMC §28.18.070);
5. A Modification to allow less than the required front yard setback for buildings 01, 07, 11, 13, 31, 39, and 42 (SBMC §28.51.060.1 and §28.92.026.A);
6. A Modification to allow less than the required interior yard setback for buildings 43, 44, and 45 (SBMC §28.51.060.2 and §28.92.026.A);
7. Certification of the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Santa Barbara Cottage Hospital Workforce Housing project (CEQA § 15091); and
8. Recommendation to City Council to approve a rezone to adjust the C-O/R-2 zone line to follow the proposed property lines for the R-2 parcels.

A Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) has been prepared and prior to an action on the project, the Planning Commission will consider certification of the EIR, and must make findings pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines Section 15091.

Case Planner: Irma Unzueta, Project Planner
Email: iunzueta@SantaBarbaraCA.gov

Irma Unzueta, Project Planner, gave the Staff presentation and introduced Dr. Charles Lambert, Ph.D., DABT; and Steve Rodriguez, EIR Consultant.

Marshall Rose, Cottage Health System Board of Directors Chair, introduced Ronald Werft, Cottage Health System President and CEO; and Brian Cearnal, Architect, who gave the applicant presentation.

Commissioners' comments and questions:

1. Asked what will be set up so that employees that live out of the City are given priority in the lottery system.
2. Asked if it would be better for MTD or the City to run the shuttle in case Cottage Health System (CHS) is not able to make the shuttle mitigation occur.
3. Commented that there would be a positive impact on Highway 101 in terms of pollution if employees that live out of town were given priority and asked if the EIR (Environmental Impact Report) had a difficulty assessing that traffic impact.

4. Asked if the impact of the cancer risk probability can be mitigated.
5. Confirmed that ultimately the Planning Commission decides whether the EIR satisfied the goals of the project.
6. Asked if the units would become timeshares or revert to the City if the owner is unable to continue as the owner, seller, and marketer of these affordable units.
7. Stated that the requested table comparing the scenario of adaptive reuse to new construction is found on page 22 of the Staff Report, but asked how terms are developed and expressed concern that, although some statistics are shown as a 50% reduction, they are termed "similar" as opposed to "reduced."
8. Requested confirmation that the use of biodiesel is found in the Conditions of Approval and asked why it cannot be mandated that biodiesel *will* be used as opposed to requiring that it be used to the extent feasible and what can be done to assure monitoring.
9. Requested an explanation of the language found on page 2-4 of the EIR, second sentence under Use Only Existing On-Site Buildings to Develop New Residences, indicating that this alternative would generally result in reduced short-term impacts, and long-term impacts that are similar to the impacts of the proposed project.
10. Asked if the numbers are accurate or if they should be aggregated on page 5.1-9 of the EIR, Table 5.1-1, because the maximum pounds per day are identifying typical demolition numbers, but grading and demolition are taking place at the same time on the timeline charts. Requested that the chart be reviewed for accuracy.
11. Asked if the applicant can assure that the intent is to make these units workforce housing or if there is a possibility that they will be sold to those not employed by CHS since the condition of approval states the Owner *may* sell it to employees.
12. Asked if there was feedback from employees as to whether it would be acceptable for them to live in a development with other CHS employees.
13. Asked what will happen to Villa Riviera.
14. Asked how performance is measured to determine if the 98% reuse or recycling of demolition materials will actually be accomplished.
15. Asked if legislation AB437, that passed in the late 1980s, which states that conditions cannot be imposed, trumps the Transportation Management provisions, CEQA requirements and findings, and the mitigation requirements.
16. Commented that Mr. Rodriguez's efforts in preparing the EIR are commendable.
17. Asked why the wording in the EIR, on page 5.5-55, relating to the shuttle program, was changed from "shall" to "should".
18. Asked what the rationality was in not providing an underground parking on the northeast portion of the property near Villa Riviera.
19. Asked if the reference that the two reuse alternatives reduce, but do not eliminate those unavoidable impacts, applies to all three intersections or whether those alternatives have better impacts on Mission and Bath Streets as opposed to others. Asked what it would take to get the Mission and Bath Streets intersection to not have an unavoidable impact. Asked how the base line condition can be taken into account for traffic analysis when St. Francis Hospital was closed-down prior to when the traffic counts were taken that were used to characterize the level of service and asked how much of the cumulative impact is understated in the EIR.

20. Asked if the applicant could make a stronger commitment to get to the Green Built three stars level.
21. Recognized the benefits of the cash bonus to encourage employees to use the shuttle.
22. Asked if balconies were included in the reuse plan for the units, if the upper balcony would shadow the balcony below, how balconies would be supported, and if balconies were factored into the cost of the project.
23. Asked if retrofitting the new City standard dome lights has been considered.
24. Stated Marborg has a program to verify the percentage of material they recycle and requested that the Cleveland Demolition Company do the same.
25. Commented that in the Staff Report there is a discussion about an agreement to provide six parking spaces for the office nearby, but they are not shown in the total required parking calculated.
26. Asked where utility poles are to be undergrounded and requested that the one on Arrellaga Street be called out and specified in the conditions of approval.
27. Asked if making larger one-story units on one floor was considered, since unable to make units go across the hallway due to construction constraints.
28. Asked if the amount of lead base paint at the project site is known and how it may impact the project.
29. Recommended the use of photo voltaics, if possible over the open parking area, to provide outside lighting for the overall project.
30. Requested that transit stop locations be proposed for both MTD and the shuttle program.

Ronald Werft, Cottage Health System President and CEO, stated that the project is not giving priority to those that live outside of Santa Barbara because there is greater demand of units than what is being supplied. The plan is to provide priority in the lottery system for every seven years of service, so that those that have provided the greatest number of years receive priority.

Steve Rodriguez, EIR Consultant, stated that the EIR recognized a beneficial effect, particularly if the units were made available to out of town employees, but it would be speculative and the EIR does not attempt to quantify that benefit.

Bobbie Bratz, Air Pollution Control District (APCD) Public Information Officer, stated that the cancer risk from the construction impacts is not calculated in the EIR because this is a short term project and the tools to calculate cancer risk do not lend themselves to that type of quantification. Ms. Hubbell added that, when unable to evaluate the impact, the mitigation cannot be determined. Dr. Charles Lambert, Board Certified Toxicologist, added that he reviewed the cancer risk modeling that was done for the proposed project and explained it is not appropriate to look at cancer as an end-point for this short-term project. It is more appropriate to look at other health effects on people in the community that might have chronic obstructed pulmonary disease, asthma and other breathing problems. Chronic health effects were considered in the EIR and it was found that the concentration of diesel particulate produced during the demolition phase of the project would be much lower than those known to cause these health effects. In addition, there is a condition of approval that, wherever possible, the applicant is to use biodiesel fuel. Biodiesel produces a much lower toxicity and particulate concentration than petroleum derived diesel.

Ms. Hubbell stated that the conditions of approval impose standard rolling affordability requirements. If CHS folds, that condition would take over; otherwise, the intent is that the units would continue affordable in perpetuity. Steven Wiley, City Attorney, added that it is important to recognize that this is going to be an employer owned project so that it is not the same situation as other affordable projects. CHS intends to retain a right of reversal so that the units could not be sold in the open market and any successor institution would hold those rights. The City's and applicant's lawyers will cover all the potentialities with no probability for loss of affordability in the recorded covenants. Ms. Hubbell concluded that this approach has been done before and gave the example of Westmont College's faculty housing.

Mr. Rodriguez stated that there is no set rule for attaching terms to the noise analysis. What would be considered is the duration and intensity of the noise. If the reduction in noise was slight or incremental, the EIR would call it "similar" although there could have been a slight decrease, but the overall impact would have been similar. If the duration or intensity of the noise would be substantially reduced, the comparison table would have referred to it as a "decrease." He explained that a 50% decibel reduction in traffic noise would not be differentiated by the human ear.

Ms. Hubbell identified the biodiesel condition found on page 24 of the Conditions of Approval, under H.7.l., and read it. She explained that the basis of requiring the use of biodiesel "to the extent feasible" is that, in some instances, pure biodiesel (B100) is not available in the south coast. The City, for example, uses B20 fuel (20% biodiesel and 80% petrodiesel) since B100 may require the purchase of new equipment. She added that, with the purpose of monitoring, introductory language can be included in the condition requiring that, prior to issuing the building permit, the plans will need to specify where and how biodiesel will be used. Mr. Rodriguez added that part of the EIR requirements is to prepare and implement a mitigation monitoring and reporting plan. Part of the requirement of that plan would be for the applicant to indicate what steps were taken to implement these air reduction measures, if feasible. There is a "burden of proof" to demonstrate why it was not feasible to implement those types of mitigation measures.

Mr. Rodriguez explained the language on page 2-4 of the EIR stating that the reuse of the former St. Francis building would result in the reduction of short-term impacts. The reuse long-term impacts would generally be similar to those of the proposed project.

Mr. Rodriguez explained that Table 5.1-1 in the EIR attempted to demonstrate daily emissions at the various demolition areas during different times.

Mr. Werft stated that CHS has no interest in subsidizing affordable units to other than CHS employees. The employees would buy the units and when a particular employee left employment, the unit would be sold back to CHS and the next employee at the top of the waiting list would be offered the unit for purchase. He explained that the challenge of homeownership is so great that employee surveys have expressed that they would not mind having co-workers as neighbors and added that 30% of the occupants will be other than CHS employees. Mr. Werft stated that there are no plans to change Villa Riviera and there is currently a high level of satisfaction among its residents.

Mr. Cearnal stated that the demolition experts would be better able to explain the criteria used to calculate the demolition materials that can be reused and recycled.

Mr. Wiley stated that legislation AB437 specifically precluded cities from mandating employer parking programs. Therefore, the shuttle program can be put in place, but employees cannot be forced to use it. Mr. Rodriguez explained that the language on page 5.5-55 of the EIR was changed from "shall" to "should" because the City does not have the authority to force implementing measures to increase participation in the shuttle program, so it has become a recommended measure. Ms. Hubbell added that the wording can be worked on to reflect stronger efforts in reviewing the effectiveness of the measure.

Mr. Cearnal stated that the northeast portion of the property was left as surface parking because there is an easement up to the Villa Riviera and it would be difficult to provide access to traffic if there was a structure there, it was an existing condition, and needed the area as an overflow parking lot.

Mr. Rodriguez stated that Table 5.5-11 shows that if the shuttle program was to be implemented, based on reasonable assumptions about ridership and use, the cumulative impact to all three intersections (Mission/Bath, Anapamu/Laguna, and Arrellaga/Garden Streets) could be reduced to a less than significant level. But, this is not a feasible mitigation measure for the City to rely on, so that a conservative view is taken on this issue. He explained that the Transportation Department staff may be able to determine how a level below a "less than significant impact" can be achieved at the intersection of Mission and Bath streets. Mr. Rodriguez explained "base-line" is the traffic that existed when St Francis was in operation and "existing" is the traffic being generated at present time. The EIR presented both the base-line and existing condition scenarios because it was thought a significant difference would result. The amount of traffic generated while St. Francis Hospital was in operation cannot be calculated, but the traffic that hospitals typically generate can be determined. It was estimated that the hospital generated 1,000 average daily trips and that the proposed housing project would generate 1,100 daily trips, therefore it would not be much of a difference.

Rob Dayton, Principal Transportation Planner, stated that efforts to mitigate the intersection of Mission and Bath Streets could include making Bath a two-way street again. Adding lanes to Mission Street would be problematic because that street feeds the interchange at Highway 101 and the interchange would have to be widened as well. CHS is already participating in looking into other circulation alternatives to facilitate access to the area, such as returning Calle Real to a two-way street. Mr. Cearnal added that Cottage Hospital has a cash incentive program so that employees living in the housing units will be encouraged to not drive their cars to work.

Mr. Cearnal stated that increasing to a Green Built three stars level ultimately depends on the available budget, and explained that, for example, placing photo voltaics on the roof of buildings would be a large initial upfront cost, but agreed to strive for the three stars level in spite of the issue of economics

Mr. Cearnal stated that, if the building was reused, it would not be appropriate to scatter balconies throughout the building because it would change the aesthetics of the building.

He explained that the openings could not be enlarged because it would structurally compromise the concrete shell, and stated that the upper balconies would shadow the ones below. They would have to be metal balconies that would probably be bracketed back to the concrete wall and would have to be retrofitted to meet current standards because it would be a change of use. The aggregate effect of trying to place a balcony on every single unit was not considered. The expense of placing balconies in the reuse units was not calculated into the reuse cost.

Ms. Hubbell stated that the installation of City standard dome lights will be added to the Conditions of Approval.

Ms. Hubbell explained that the six office parking spaces proposed in the Staff Report would be used by visitors in the evening and primarily by the off-site office during the day, so that it would be a shared-use.

Mr. Cearnal stated he was not aware of any utility poles being removed or relocated that would require undergrounding. Mark Wilde, Senior Plan Check Engineer, confirmed that no utility poles are to be undergrounded at this time.

Mr. Cearnal stated that the problem with making units that are flat and larger in the reuse scenario, by gutting the building and installing wall-to-wall columns within those flats, is that they would have to be served by a continuous exterior/exit balcony along the back side of the building. There would only be windows on one side, without the benefit of light and air going into the units, and any other windows facing the exterior/balcony would make residents feel as if they were living in a cheap motel. A townhouse would only allow one floor that does not have that exterior/exit balcony. He also reported that employees at the four workshops expressed negativity towards the notion of the reuse units. It is not only a matter of providing residential units because CHS employees are able to purchase a home out of the area. The bottom line is that the reuse units would not meet the employees' needs.

Mr. Cearnal explained that, whether the building is reused or demolished, a thorough analysis has been done of the building as to what will have to be done to remove the toxic materials. Although significant toxic materials were not reported, the removal of materials has to be done in a containable fashion.

Chair Jostes announced a recess at 5:29 P.M. and reconvened at 6:13 P.M.

Chair Jostes opened the public hearing at 6:16 P.M.

The following people spoke in support of the project:

1. Bernie Krakower, Santa Barbara Regional Chamber of Commerce, stated that this project is an absolute requirement due to an aging population that needs better medical care and in order to attract healthcare providers by providing adequate housing.
2. Peter Jordano stated that cannot afford to delay project construction any longer because construction costs are increasing at a rate of 1.5% a month.
3. Monique Hartley stated that the former St. Francis Hospital buildings were additions of no significant historical impacts.

4. Ann Lippincott, adjacent neighbor, understands the inconvenience of construction. She stated the proposed project is much more in keeping with the surrounding neighborhood and is supportive of off-street parking in the neighborhood.
5. Sarada Lewis, Registered Nurse at SBCH, stated the benefits of providing housing to employees are that they are here when crisis occur, they reinvest income into the local community, and are vested in the welfare of Santa Barbara because it becomes their home and they care; the healthcare security will be increased and would create a positive solution to the nursing shortage.
6. Samuel Leer, Director of Social Services at SBCH, stated that Cottage Hospital services are indispensable and essential for quality of life in the community. The project will enable healthcare professionals by ensuring that they realize the dream of owning a home, with the bonus that it will allow recruiting qualified professionals. Commented it could be that one of the occupants of the housing development will save the life of one of the meeting attendants.
7. Tokie Shynk, Director of Critical Care Services at SBCH, stated it takes three to five years to train critical care nurses, but has seen many leave the area in search of owning their own home because they are unable to afford one in Santa Barbara. Many nurses are anxiously awaiting the approval of the project so that they too can work at a hospital and community that they love, but still be able to own their own home.
8. Ronald Nye read a letter into the record from Shelly Bookspan, author of the project's Historic Structures Report (HSR), who emphasized her ethical integrity in the preparation of the HSR.
9. Dr. Chris Lambert emphasized the need of adequate healthcare providers living in the community to guarantee adequate response times during multiple casualty emergencies. The demand for healthcare is rising even as the supply for adequately trained professionals is dwindling, so that the community does not have the luxury of putting off this project indefinitely.
10. Chair Jostes read a letter into the record from Matt Vaughan, President of the Santa Barbara Association of Realtors, that stated employees have difficulty in qualifying for affordable housing and are unable to afford purchasing high cost homes in the area.
11. Patrice Ryan, Vice-President of Human Resources at SBCH, stated employees know they are able to find affordable housing out of the area and that is why each year approximately 40 people have left employment at Cottage Hospital. The possibility of reuse has been evaluated, but Cottage employees, of which 1,000 do not own homes, know they can find comfortable housing elsewhere that is less costly, and so it is critical to provide workforce housing to retain staff and provide a venue for individuals considering employment at Cottage. This project would be one of the tools employees need to do their job.
12. Judy Carpenter, SBCH employee, highlighted the lack of affordable housing impacting employees and stated 25% of Cottage employees commute from out of the area.
13. Steven Amerikaner, President of Coastal Housing Coalition, stated that the Coastal Housing Coalition unanimously concluded that the project deserves support. This is an opportunity to make a significant dent in the employee housing problem and Cottage Hospital is a model employer in attempting to do so.

14. Chris Henson, Director of Coastal Housing Coalition, commented that employee quality of life should also include workforce housing.
15. Linda Havlik, Realtor, spoke about the great need for workforce housing and emphasized that all in the community are connected and need each other, so that project will bring greater good to a greater number of people.
16. Eva Turenchalk stated Cottage does not have a choice because the hospital cannot relocate to another community, so that as a non-profit organization it is an exemplary employer in its willingness to provide employee housing.
17. Kristin Anderson stated that living right next to the highway results in more exposure to car emissions than the project's neighbors who would be exposed to only 1.4 years of construction equipment emissions. Others in the community have had to make adjustments to accommodate the construction in their neighborhood. The hospital is understaffed in emergencies due to a lack of local employees, so that the project will help the greater community.
18. Lisa Oshins, Coastal Housing Coalition, stated the La Conchita landslide and the Painted Cave fire clearly indicate that the community cannot afford having employees living out of the area.
19. Carla Griffith, SBCH employee, stated that full time positions are aggressively being recruited, but the stumbling block is the cost of housing. If more healthcare providers leave the area, patients will be forced in the future to travel outside the area to receive healthcare.
20. Matt Tirrell, UCSB Dean of Engineering and SBCH Board of Directors, stated the community is dependent on the skills and availability of employees. The project proposes quality of housing where employees will feel comfortable.
21. C.J. Jackson, SBCH Board of Directors, stated the applicant has attempted a partnership to work hand-in-hand with the community and respond to a great need.
22. Mickey Flacks, County Housing Authority, stated the project does not represent tenements and it is at no expense to tax-payers. The project gives a greater percentage of affordable housing in contrast to the usual proposed developments. Would prefer giving priority in the lottery system to people that currently live outside the area and that have only one car.
23. Wynelle Chase, SBCH volunteer, stated it is no longer possible for teachers, nurses, and laboratory technicians to purchase a home in the City. There is only so much that can be done to convert an old patient hospital room into a comfortable living space and employees deserve much better.
24. Ron Cronk, Vice-President of Westmont College, referred to the workforce housing at Westmont College and stated that the 41 affordable homes built have made a dramatic change in the ability to recruit and retain faculty. Prior to the housing project, it was often difficult to convince candidates to accept offers of employment or even show up for an interview due to the high cost of housing. It has proven to be a model of a public/private partnership to help meet a critical need in the community. The approval of the proposed project will ensure that the community will continue to receive a high level of healthcare from a local workforce.

25. Patti Corbett, SBCH employee, stated the Cottage Hospital is short over 100 nurses, because it is not able to attract and retain quality healthcare providers, and can only continue providing good patient care by paying high salaries and housing to temporary employees. Those monies could otherwise be used in other essential areas.
26. Rick Scott, President of Santa Barbara Cancer Center, applauded the high number of trees proposed in the plans, and stated that during the La Conchita landslide, the Cancer Center was short of highly trained employees that live out of town and could only get through to Santa Barbara by traveling up to ten hours.
27. Susan Ayer, Teacher, stated that the former St. Francis site is unattractive. Many of the Outpatient Surgery Center employees will be retiring soon and new employees that replace them will not be able to afford buying homes in the City.
28. Dr. Judith Kuipers, President of Fielding Graduate University, stated the project is an attractive alternative for the geographical area. High density housing does not have to be unattractive and dysfunctional, and pointed out that traffic and speeding issues are seen throughout the City.
29. Courtney Seeple stated that every construction project may cause some health hazard. Agreed the neighbors will be discomforted during the demolition, but the proposed project will resolve many issues that affect the overall community.
30. Brian Borgatello from Marborg Industries stated that Marborg is permitted to recycle up to 1,250 tons daily and 600 tons of demolition debris is actually recycled by the company every day. Marborg has the capacity to recycle the project's debris and is located less than three miles away.
31. Charles Butler, adjacent neighbor, stated that, when St. Francis was in operation, there was much noise and traffic. He would be opposed to adaptive use of the site due to the size, bulk, and scale of the current building.
32. Debbie Sweeney stated there are already bus services in the area, is within walking distance to grocery stores and downtown, parking will be hidden, and the density proposed is appropriate to the neighborhood.
33. Jim Knight agreed that Cottage is a model employer in proposing workforce housing.
34. Pamela Easter, Registered Nurse at SBCH, stated that she had other options for employment out of town when she chose to relocate to Santa Barbara. She had difficulty finding a place to live in the area.. This project would provide hope to those that want to stay in Santa Barbara and dream of owning a home.
35. Michael Towbes, SBCH Board of Directors, stated reuse of the property would be better as a hotel, but not affordable housing and commented that the proposed project is a gift to the community.
36. Jon Martin stated that the market rate will continue to increase and Cottage will have to eventually work out a larger subsidy if the project continues to be delayed, and commented that the proposed density is appropriate.
37. Ms. Hubbell read a statement into the record from Melinda Staveley, Rehabilitation Institute President/CEO, stating that one of the most difficult challenges facing employers in the City is the cost of housing. The type of housing and where to build are issues without a clear and simple action that will please everyone. The factors of esthetics, convenience, perception of property value, density, simple resistance to change, and many others are raised by one constituency or another no matter the

proposed location or the housing design. The City must increase by many-fold the number of affordable housing units if the community is to recruit and retain skilled, desirable employees.

The following people spoke in opposition to the project:

1. John McKinney, Bungalow Haven Neighborhood Association, agreed that affordable housing is an important community concern and the solution should offer the most benefit with the least impact. Stated the review process and the EIR produced by that process have been compromised, making the EIR inadequate as presented and uncertifiable. Pointed out that only the most objective historian should be selected to provide a Historic Structures Report. Highlighted the points made by Paige Swartley, from the Brandt-Hawley Law Group, in a letter directed to the Planning Commission. Explained that the presenters against the project dedicated many hours to the study of these documents in preparing for the public hearing presentation.
2. Jennifer Miller, Bungalow Haven Neighborhood Association, expressed concern with street safety and the impacts of increased traffic caused by the project. The Transportation Circulation Committee was not involved in this project. St. Francis Hospital had a 41 average bed count in five years, so that the statistics in the EIR are out of date. Concerned about truck drivers unfamiliar with streets while driving fully loaded trucks. The EIR does not adequately report on traffic concerns and does not define haul routes.
3. Brad Parks, Bungalow Haven Neighborhood Association, expressed concern about the short and long term health risks to the neighborhood inhabitants that are sensitive receptors (i.e., elderly and children). The Staff Report and EIR define health risks as less than significant, but he described actual health risks that may result from the demolition of this site. Suggested a mitigation to relocate sensitive receptors while the project is being constructed and would like to see that the total amount of units be sold to Cottage employees. Welcomed the employees as neighbors.
4. Cheri Rae, Bungalow Haven Neighborhood Association, stated that the EIR fails to properly study significant health concerns to the neighboring population and goes out of its way to misrepresent the data. The EIR does not mitigate the health effects that a physician hired by the applicant described in a presentation regarding the health risks associated with the project. Requested the project be required to monitor the health of the neighborhood with respect to diesel emissions and the significant unmitigable noise impacts. The Final EIR erroneously states several times that the project poses no significant public health impact when, in fact, the impacts are unknown and cannot be predicted at this time.
5. Steve Dowty, Bungalow Haven Neighborhood Association, addressed some of the adaptive reuse issues and gave a presentation of hospitals that converted their hospital rooms into residences. Adaptive reuse and historic preservation go hand-in-hand and reuse is cost effective, energy conserving, and results in traffic impact reduction. Construction duration is reduced up to 50% and volume of debris is reduced by 63%, resulting in savings of 20%-30% over new construction costs.
6. Roger Friedland, UCSB professor and adjacent neighbor, expressed concern about the significant flow of traffic on Micheltorena Street and diesel emissions impacting

respiratory health in children and compromising their immune system. Although would like to have Cottage employees as neighbors in the perimeter of the project, requested that the scale of demolition be reduced, that the applicant be required to use biodiesel and consider an adaptive reuse plan.

7. Larry Gerstein expressed concern about the demolition. Appreciates Cottage providing housing, but proposal is three times the density of the surrounding neighborhood, causing significant impact in traffic and stated there already is much traffic due to Santa Barbara High School and the County Bowl. Would expect a shuttle be provided to help alleviate traffic impacts, but residents would be packed in as sardines and suggested reducing the project to one-third its proposed size.
8. Susan Gerstein stated that the removal of the round-about on Valerio has greatly simplified the traffic flow in the area, but the propose increase in parking spaces would not contribute in the simplification of the traffic flow pattern and cannot imagine how streets will accommodate to the increased traffic. Concerned that there is no room at the exit on California Street, so that it will more than likely become a one-way street.
9. Jennifer Miller expressed concern about increase of project cost.
10. Gary Hoffman, adjacent neighbor, expressed concern about health and non-health risks, including cancer causing exposure in early life. Stated that Environmental Protection Agency's Methodology is readily available and requested that the EIR be circulated.
11. Bob Cibull, adjacent neighbor, expressed concern with the building density and stated that too many housing units are proposed in the middle of a residential neighborhood. Concerned about some of the units possibly being sold and converted into luxury condos. Acknowledged there is a great need for workforce housing, but suggested that other sites owned by Cottage be used. Commented this could potentially be a good project.
12. Tom Ostwald, adjacent neighbor, does not believe there is a surplus of parking in the neighborhood. Suggested other solutions, including reducing size of units and using other sites owned by Cottage that could be incorporated to have more parking per unit.
13. Jim Westby, Santa Barbara Safe Streets, supports Cottage's intent to provide housing for employees, but strongly opposes the modification request for density and yard setbacks since they will significantly impact surrounding neighborhoods. Requested that mitigation conditions be placed for environmental hazards to protect the area residents. Does not believe the traffic study assumptions are correct. Concerned that R-2 zone properties could be changed in the future regardless of ownership.
14. Naomi Kovacs, Citizens Planning Association, commented that the EIR is not a full disclosure document as required by CEQA and cannot be certified and that the project architect did his own study on reuse of the existing hospital buildings, but is not a reuse specialist.
15. Sydney Siemens, adjacent neighbor, stated the proposed project is not compatible with the neighborhood and expressed concern with the reduction in the housing value of the surrounding homes.
16. James Kahan, Allied Neighborhood Association, stated that the Board of Directors unanimously decided to oppose the proposed project. Commented that the cultural resources were completely ignored in the EIR and that selling part of the housing units

- at market value does not make sense. Stated that adaptive reuse requires additional evaluation.
17. Stephen Fountain, adjacent neighbor, commented that the project would increase the traffic problem in an already over-congested area and requested compensation for vibration impacts for those that would not be able to live in their home during the demolition and would not be able to rent it due to exposure of health risks. Requested a relocation plan be proposed for those with health sensitivity and compensation for disruption of their lives.
 18. Leslee Sipress, adjacent neighbor, stated that, although the workforce housing is needed, there is concerned with the size, bulk, and scale; and pointed out that the decisions made will affect future generations. Requested that market rate units be eliminated and density reduced.
 19. Betsy Ingalls moved into the neighborhood because it is quiet and pleasant, but the project as proposed would disrupt the ambiance of tranquility. Requested that other sites be considered for the project.
 20. Kellam De Forest, Pearl Chase Society, stated that it is worth exploring all alternatives and commented that, besides condo use, the building could be used for other purposes and there are other sites owned by Cottage throughout the City that could be used for employee housing.
 21. Cheryl Swanson stated it would be more prudent to have healthcare first-responders dispersed throughout the community rather than clustered in a single site. Asked if there would be oversight during removal of toxic materials.
 22. Judy McKee stated that the project is an admirable, but is concerned with the undisclosed risks and would prefer an evaluation by objective experts.
 23. Chair Jostes read a letter into the record from Susan Petty stating there are issues that have not been fully assessed and that Santa Barbara High School students will be affected by the massive destruction project.

The following people submitted requests to speak, but were unable to stay the duration of the hearing:

1. Jennifer McGovern, noted speaker slip in support.
2. Anne Weber, noted speaker slip in support.
3. Mathew Andresen, noted speaker slip in support.
4. Jay Higgins, noted speaker slip in support.
5. Annemarie Cameron, noted speaker slip in support.
6. Robin Eschler, noted speaker slip in support.
7. Elly Bajor, noted speaker slip in opposition.
8. Molly Kellogg, noted speaker slip in opposition.
9. Michael Gardner, noted speaker slip in opposition.

With no one else wishing to speak, the public hearing was closed at 9:32 P.M.

Commissioners' comments and questions:

1. Asked if Staff had input as to the current Cottage Hospital project and if there have been any complaints about vibrations, diesel, and smoke.

2. Asked if the complaints regarding dust are related to demolition or construction at the current Cottage Hospital construction project.
3. Requested that the issue of structural damage taking place within 100 feet of the construction site, as opposed to the back yard property line, be addressed and possibly modified.
4. Requested that the statement in the EIR indicating that the shuttle program be implemented no later than 75% occupancy of the units be reviewed to possibly increase to 50% occupancy rate.
5. Requested that the two charts that refer to the construction time schedule and the total amount of emissions per demolition grading and construction, with the purpose of providing a more credible report be restudied.
6. Requested that Staff contact other recycling entities to get a second opinion as to the percentage of the applicant's ability to recycle and reuse.
7. Requested that some of the conditions be tightened-up because there are several "if feasible" statements. Would like to have stronger wording for the applicant to achieve Built Green standards and review how the applicant can get to a three stars level, so as to use this project as a positive precedent for future projects.
8. Requested that more specific information as to the availability of biodiesel fuel and if/how it will become available.
9. Requested that the CHS Board give careful consideration as to how employees will be selected and the issue of out of town employees not being able to get into the City during unforeseen occurrences, such as was the case during the La Conchita landslide.

Ms. Unzueta reported that there have not been many complaints on the current Cottage Hospital construction project. The complaints have been with respect to the demolition dust and inconveniences relating to construction hours. The Project Environmental Coordinator (PEC) who is in charge of making sure that all conditions are being met has been able to resolve issues as they occur. The Pueblo parking structure is well underway and near completion. The energy center and the Knapp Building are still under construction.

Ms. Hubbell stated that conditions have been established for truck routes that are intended to minimize the impacts to the traffic in the neighborhood during the demolition of the St. Francis building and during the construction of the new housing units.

Mr. Werft stated that homeownership for employees is the key to retain employees. Cottage staff has already found solutions for the rental needs through rental assistance programs; therefore, there is no need to construct a development to provide rental units.

Ms. Hubbell stated that the City does not see a conflict of interest with respect to the historian that wrote the HSR. Mr. Wiley added that Ms. Bookspan has been accused of an ethical conflict of interest, but that issue has nothing to do with the EIR and does not affect the findings found in the HSR. No one has demonstrated that there are any errors in the HSR so that, from a legal point of view, it is not a conflict of interest. Ms. Weiss added that the City has a peer review process and not only has provided HSR submittal requirements to those found in its list of qualified preparers, but has hired an expert in the field in addition to the fact that City Council has entrusted the responsibility of reviewing HSRs to the Historic Landmarks Commission. The process was reviewed and no flaw or challenge was found in

terms of its content. She pointed out that those that object to Ms. Bookspan's report are not professional architectural historians and have not offered any specific information, other than referring to the City's own documentation.

Ms. Weiss stated that the City is in agreement with comments made by the APCD representatives and has incorporated their specific language in the ERRATA, so that a continuance would allow an opportunity for the public to review it.

MOTION: Myers/Jacobs

Continue the hearing to September 21, 2006.

This motion carried by the following vote:

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

V. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

A. Committee and Liaison Reports.

Mr. Mahan reported that the De La Guerra Plaza Design Review Committee met September 13th to discuss one of the goals that City Council wants the Committee to achieve, which is De La Guerra Plaza becoming ADA accessible. The project architects presented three conceptual scenarios. The first scenario brings a complexity because the sidewalks on the west side of the Plaza are not wide enough for ADA compliance. If the sidewalks are made wider, they take an area away from the street, but the Fire Department did not agree with a narrower street. The second scenario deals with the particulars and the third scenario involves connectivity from the Storke Placita. The plans and report will be going to City Council on October 3rd to give better direction to the Committee and consultants.

Mr. Mahan reported that there will be an Airline Terminal Design Committee meeting on September 20th and Ms. Jacobs added that the architect's revised designs will be heard by the Planning Commission on October 5th.

Mr. Jostes reported he attended the Boards and Commissions Chairs luncheon on September 13th and two issues were raised that are relevant to the Planning Commission: 1) The City Administrator highlighted that if the upcoming Prop 90 initiative was to pass, which relates to eminent domain and issues of takings, it may bring in to question the City's General Plan update as being a taking if there were to be any significant modification of the allowable uses due to downzonings. 2) The Historic Landmarks Commission (HLC) expressed concern over the size, bulk, and scale on lower Chapala Street and changing that neighborhood's character.

Ms. Jacobs stated that lower Chapala Street is the kind of development that lends itself to form-based zoning. Discussions would provide a broader opportunity for input from HLC and the community as to the development of upper State Street while its planning is still in process.

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

None were reviewed.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Jostes adjourned the meeting at 9:55 P.M.

Submitted by,

Gabriela Feliciano, Commission Secretary