DRAFT

2. 1776 Eucalyptus Hill Road has been appealed and will be heard by the City Council on March 20, 2007. Commissioner Thompson will represent the Planning Commission.

3. 3408-3412 State Street has been appealed and will be heard by the City Council on March 27, 2007. Commissioner Jostes will represent the Planning Commission

4. 1443 San Miguel Avenue has been appealed and will be heard by the City Council on April 10, 2007. Commissioner Myers will represent the Planning Commission.

5. 1533 West Valerio Street has been appealed to City Council and the date is pending.

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

Chair Jacobs opened the public hearing at 1:07 P.M. and welcomed students from Dr. Paul Wack's UCSB class on Principles of Environmental Planning. With no one wishing to speak, the hearing was closed.

II. NEW ITEMS:

ACTUAL TIME: 1:08 P.M.

A. **APPLICATION OF JAN HOCHHAUSER, ARCHITECT FOR 1722 STATE STREET INVESTORS, LLC, PROPERTY OWNER, 1722 STATE STREET, APN: 027-102-021, C-2 COMMERCIAL ZONE AND R-1 ONE FAMILY RESIDENCE ZONE, GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: GENERAL COMMERCE AND OFFICES (MST2005-00455)**

The project involves the construction of a 56,615 square foot three-story building that would provide both residential and commercial uses. The project would provide 12 residential condominium units (23,606 total square feet), and 9,100 square feet of commercial condominium space. Parking for the residential units and commercial uses would be provided in a 23,909 square foot below-grade parking area. The project proposes to provide 22 parking spaces for the residential uses and 33 spaces for the commercial uses, for a total of 55 spaces. Access to the underground parking garage would be provided by a single driveway located on State Street.

Ten (10) of the proposed residential units would be market rate units, and two would be inclusionary middle-income affordable units. Eight (8) of the market rate units would have two-bedrooms and would range between 1,771 and 2,349 square feet in size. Two (2) of the market rate units would have three bedrooms and would range between 1,988 and 2,680 square feet in area. Of the two affordable units, one would have two bedrooms (976 square feet) and the other would have three bedrooms (1,179 square feet).

A variety of commercial uses could be located in the proposed project, including a mix of specialty retail, general office and medical-dental office space.

The existing 7,500 square foot commercial building and parking lot would be demolished as part of the project.

The discretionary applications required for this project are:

1. A Zoning Map Amendment to change the zoning from R-1, One Family Residential, to R-3, Limited Multi-Family Residence Zone (SBMC §28.92.080.B);
2. A Modification to allow 55 parking spaces instead of the Santa Barbara Municipal Code required 63 spaces (SBMC §28.90.100.G & I and §28.92.110.A.1);
3. A Modification of the minimum lot area required to allow for 9 two-bedroom units and 3 three-bedroom units on a 28,875 square foot lot instead of the required 29,280 square feet of lot area in order to accommodate two inclusionary (bonus density) housing units (SBMC §28.21.080.G and §28.92.110.A.2);
4. A Development Plan to allow Minor and Small Additions for the construction of a 1,600 square foot increase of nonresidential development (SBMC §28.87.300);
5. A Tentative Subdivision Map for a one-lot subdivision to create twelve (12) residential condominium units and 15,576 square feet of commercial condominium space (SBMC §27.07 and 27.13); and
6. A Conditional Use Permit to allow nonresidential parking in a residential zone (SBMC §28.94.030 H).

The Planning Commission will consider approval of the Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared for the project pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines Section 15074.

Case Planner: Allison De Busk, Project Planner
Email: adebusk@SantaBarbaraCA.gov

Allison De Busk, Project Planner, gave the Staff presentation.

Jan Hochhauser, Architect, gave the applicant presentation.

Staff and Mr. Hochhauser answered Planning Commission questions on Floor Area Ratio (FAR), project square footage, clarification on the project's net versus gross square footage, and comparable recently approved projects. Additional questions were answered about landscaping, mechanical equipment on roof, solar panels, solar ordinance compliance, windows and openings along the property line, shared-use parking, plate heights, and residential open space over commercial space. Other

inquiries addressed concerned fire access, storage, Built Green considerations, undergrounding utility lines, pedestrian walking experience, and commercial versus residential space.

Chair Jacobs opened the public hearing at 2:18 P.M.

Dennis Whelan spoke in support of the project and asked about the future of the screen on the existing building.

With no one else wishing to speak, the public hearing was closed at 2:22 P.M.

Commissioner's comments:

1. Commission expressed appreciation for development of the project over the past 18 months and the incorporation of underground parking.
2. Expressed concern over the size, bulk, and scale of project. Suggested reducing the number of bedrooms and the size of the State Street side units, specifically units K and L. Many of the Commissioners felt that the units are far too large, especially units A, F and L. Would like to see some mass pulled away from State Street.
3. The project will need to address Charter Section 1507.
   Many of the Commissioners felt the traffic and parking analysis was flawed and felt that the project will generate more traffic than at the present time. Concern was expressed over adding traffic to Mission Street.
4. Commended the use of solar and would like to see the project raised to a 2 or 3 star Built Green status. There was some concern expressed with impacts of the solar panels on neighbors.
5. Most Commissioners could not support the proposed parking modification and felt that more study is needed. One Commissioner felt that parking should be reduced and supported the modification for parking.
6. Several Commissioners would like to see more than the two affordable units included and suggested adding at least one more. Also, would like to see more integration and improvement in circulation among all units.
7. Would like to see the courtyard space lightened and designed to encourage residential use and interaction. Suggested breaking up the ridgeline. A Condition of Approval should stipulate that the courtyard should never be gated. Consideration should be given to having more than just sky views in the courtyard. Commissioners liked the courtyard but felt it wasn't quite there yet. The courtyard pushes the building mass outward, and the streetscape pays the price.
8. Two Commissioners expressed concern with windows being too close to the property line to the north and south and the impact on any future neighboring development. Concerns were for units G, F, and E. Would like to see potential for light studied.

9. Some Commissioners could not support the Negative Declaration due to questions about the traffic analysis.
10. Concerned with view loss on the north side of the building. Some Commissioners would like to see more attention to views in the Negative Declaration.
11. Would like to see project get closer to zoning requirement and away from the need for a parking modification. Suggested reducing the commercial space on the second floor that could reduce parking demand.
12. Would like to have Historic Landmarks Commission review the reduction of the plate heights wherever possible.
13. Suggestions were made to include existing grillwork in the project.
14. Suggested adding a condition that states that the sidewalk is a parkway sidewalk and add considerations for pedestrian amenities. Need for more consideration to pedestrian streetscape, including more windows, landscaping and courtyard visibility.
15. Page two of the Negative Declaration Response to Comments needs to correctly reflect the area requesting a zoning modification.
16. Some Commissioners expressed concern over the number of elevators and the contribution of the elevators to building mass. Other Commissioners felt the number of elevators need to be on the high side to accommodate the elderly, frail, and families.
17. Would like to see the affordable housing units appear less like secondary units, especially with regard to size, location, and private outdoor living space.
18. One Commissioner sees mid-State Street as an invitation for walking and street animation. Pedestrians like amenities such as public restrooms, shading, and water.

Ms. Hubbell cautioned the Commission on variable density and inclusionary requirements and affordable housing requirements. Guidance was also given to the Commission on allowed density and use of bonus density. Ms. Hubbell stated that there were no policies that addressed mid-block State Street views and therefore did not heighten Staff's concerns. Topography continues to rise behind parcel and vegetation hides all but a minor glimpse of the mountains. This is definitely not an environmental issue; it may be a design issue.

Mr. Hochhauser asked for greater understanding on the balance of affordable units, elevators and parking. Commissioners provided input on the lack of support for the parking modification and lot area modification. In consideration of feedback received, Mr. Hockhauser asked for a continuance.

Chair Jacobs gave the applicant feedback on the general vision for the mid-State Street area that bridges the downtown commercial corridor with a residential neighborhood to the north, along with the Neighborhood Preservation study that had been done in that area.

MOTION: Jostes/Larson
Continued the project to April 19, 2007

This motion carried by the following vote:

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

Chair Jacobs called a recess at 3:48 P.M. and reconvened the meeting at 4:06 P.M.

MOTION: White/Larson
Reconsider the prior action of the Commission of 1722 State Street.

This motion carried by the following vote:

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

MOTION: White/Myers
Continue the 1722 State Street project to April 5, 2007.

This motion carried by the following vote:

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

ACTUAL TIME: 4:10 P.M.

B. **APPLICATION OF EVERETT WOODY, ARCHITECT FOR JEFF & JULIE FRIEDMAN FAMILY TRUST, PROPERTY OWNER, 1014 GARDEN STREET, 029-221-026, R-3/ C-2 MULTIPLE FAMILY RESIDENCE AND COMMERCIAL ZONES, GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: OFFICES AND RESIDENTIAL, 12 UNITS PER ACRE (MST2007-00018)**

The proposed project involves a proposal for a change in zone from R-3/C-2 to C-2, and a setback modification, both intended to abate two existing zoning violations. A recently permitted two-unit residential condominium project currently under construction does not meet the Solar Ordinance in the R-3 portion of the lot. A zone change to C-2 will abate this violation. The building was also permitted with an architectural column located up to the interior property line and within the interior yard setback. This encroachment was not previously recognized or approved as a modification to the interior yard. The discretionary applications required for this project are:

ASSOCIATED TRANSPORTATION ENGINEERS
100 N. Hope Avenue, Suite 4, Santa Barbara, CA 93110 • (805) 687-4418 • FAX (805) 682-8509

Richard L. Pool, P.E.
Scott A. Schell, AICP

March 13, 2007

05122L04.WPD

Jan Hochhauser
Hochhauser and Blatter
122 E. Arrellaga Street
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

ADDENDUM TO THE TRAFFIC AND PARKING STUDY FOR THE 1722 STATE STREET MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT, CITY OF SANTA BARBARA, CALIFORNIA

Associated Transportation Engineers (ATE) has prepared the following addendum to the traffic and parking study for the 1722 State Street Mixed-Use Development, proposed in the City of Santa Barbara. The addendum analyzes three additional land uses scenarios for the proposed project in response to comments provided at the Planning Commission hearing held for the project earlier this month. A discussion of the project's parking requirements is also provided.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project site is located at 1722 State Street between Islay Street on the north and Valerio Street on the south, in the City of Santa Barbara. The site contains an existing 7,200 square-foot (S.F.) commercial building. The building was formerly occupied by a Bank of America, and more recently has operated as a campus for the Brooks Institute of Photography. Based on input provided by City staff, the traffic generated by the existing building will be analyzed for two land use scenarios:

1) Assuming general office uses (rather than the previous bank use)

2) Based on traffic counts conducted at the site when the Brooks Institute of Photography occupied the building.

The revised project is proposing to demolish the existing building and construct 10 condominium units and 8,400 S.F. (net) of building area. Parking for the project would be provided in a subterranean parking garage with 55 spaces. This addendum provides an analysis of the proposed building with two different land use scenarios:

1) Assuming all general office uses.

2) Assuming all medical office uses.

PROJECT TRIP GENERATION

The following text reviews the trip generation estimates developed for the existing and proposed uses based on the land use scenarios reviewed above.

Scenario #1

The first scenario assumes that the existing building is occupied by office uses rather than the historical Bank of America or Brooks Institute uses. The rates presented in the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual[1] for General Office Buildings (Land Use #710) were used.

For the future uses, this scenario assumes that new 8,400 S.F. building would be occupied with office uses, and that 10 condominiums would be constructed onsite. The ITE rates for Residential Condominiums/Townhouses (Land Use #230) and General Offices Buildings were used for the calculations. Table 1 shows the net trip generation estimates for this scenario.

---

1 Trip Generation, Institute of Transportation Engineers, 7th Edition, 2003

Table 1
Scenario 1 Trip Generation Estimates - Existing Office and Future Office

Land Use	Size	ADT		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour	
		Rate	Trips	Rate	Trips	Rate	Trips
Existing - Office	7,200 S.F.	22.66(a)	163	2.97(a)	21	3.40(a)	25
Future - Office	8,400 S.F.	22.66(a)	190	2.97(a)	25	3.40(a)	29
Condominiums	10 Units	5.86	59	0.44	4	0.52	5
Subtotal			249		29		34
Net Traffic Generated			86		8		9

(a) ADT and A.M. peak hour rate based on ITE 7th edition equations. P.M. rate based on ITE 5th edition equation.

Table 1 shows that for this scenario the project would result in a net increase of 86 ADT, 8 A.M. PHT, and 9 P.M. PHT. This project scenario would not generate impacts to the critical intersections in the Mission Street corridor based on the City's thresholds of significance. Once the net project-generated trips are distributed to and from the site, the project would add less than 5 peak hour trips to the Mission Street intersections, and thus would not generate impacts based on the methodology used by the City's in assessing traffic impacts.

Scenario #2

The second scenario also assumes that the existing building is occupied by general office uses rather than the historical Bank of America or Brooks Institute uses. For the future uses, this scenario assumes that the new 8,400 S.F. building would be occupied by Medical Office uses (with10 condominium units). The ITE rates for Residential Condominiums/Townhouses and Medical/Dental Offices were used for the calculations. Table 2 shows the net trip generation estimates for this scenario.

Table 2
Scenario 2 Trip Generation Estimates - Existing Office and Future Medical Office

Land Use	Size	ADT		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour	
		Rate	Trips	Rate	Trips	Rate	Trips
Existing - Office	7,200 S.F.	22.66(a)	163	2.97(a)	21	3.40(a)	25
Future - Medical Office	8,400 S.F	36.13	303	2.48	21	3.72	31
Condominiums	10 Units	5.86	59	0.44	4	0.52	5
Subtotal			362		25		36
Net Traffic Generated			199		4		11

(a) ADT and A.M. peak hour rate based on ITE 7th edition equations. P.M. rate based on ITE 5th edition equation.

Table 2 shows that for this scenario, the project would result in a net increase of 199 ADT, 4 A.M. PHT, and 11 P.M. PHT. This project scenario would not generate impacts to the critical intersections in the Mission Street corridor based on the City's thresholds of significance. Once the net project-generated trips are distributed to and from the site, the project would add less than 5 peak hour trips to the Mission Street intersections, and thus would not generate impacts based on the traffic assessment methodology used by the City.

Scenario #3

The third scenario develops traffic estimates for the existing building based on traffic counts conducted at the site driveway when the Brooks Institute of Photography occupied the building. This scenario therefore represents the actual traffic that was generated at the site.

For the future uses, this scenario assumes that the new 8,400 S.F. building would be occupied by Medical Office uses with 10 condominium units. The ITE rates for Residential Condominiums/Townhouses and Medical/Dental Offices were used for the calculations. Table 3 shows the net trip generation estimates for this scenario.

Table 3
Scenario 3 Trip Generation Estimates - Existing Brooks and Future Medical Office

Land Use	Size	ADT		A.M. Peak Hour		P.M. Peak Hour	
		Rate	Trips	Rate	Trips	Rate	Trips
Existing - Brooks	7,200 S.F.	(a)	770	(b)	44	(b)	77
Future - Medical Office	8,400 S.F	36.13	303	2.48	21	3.72	31
Condominiums	10 Units	5.86	59	0.44	4	0.52	5
Subtotal			362		25		36
Net Traffic Generated			- 408		- 19		- 41

(a) Based on ITE ADT/P.M. Peak Hour Factor relationship.

(b) Based on peak hour counts conducted at the site

Table 3 shows that for this scenario, the project would result in a net decrease of 408 ADT, 19 A.M. PHT, and 41 P.M. PHT. This shows that the proposed project would generate significantly less traffic than the Brooks Institute of Photography school that previously occupied the site.

PARKING ANALYSIS

City Zoning Ordinance Requirements

The City's Zoning Ordinance parking ratios for each of the project components are summarized below. The City's Zoning Ordinance is based on the net square-feet of the building.

Commercial: 1 space/250 S.F. (net)

Condominiums: 2 spaces/2- and 3-Bedroom unit
1 guest space/4 units

Based on these ratios, the project's Zoning Ordinance parking requirements were calculated as shown below in Table 4.

City of Santa Barbara Zoning Ordinance Parking Requirements

Land Use	Size(a)	City Parking Ratio	Parking Space Requirement
Commercial	8,400 S.F.	1 space/250 S.F..	34 spaces
Condominiums	10 Units	2 spaces/2 & 3 Bedroom 1 guest space/4 units	20 spaces 3 spaces
Total			**57 spaces**

(a) Net square-feet of building

The data presented in Table 4 show that the City Zoning Ordinance parking requirement for the project is 57 spaces. The project currently provides parking in a subterranean parking garage with 55 spaces. A parking modification for two parking spaces will therefore be required for the project.

Parking Demand Analysis

The actual parking demand generated by the project may be greater than or less than the number of spaces required by the City's Zoning Ordinance. Also, the City's Zoning Ordinance parking requirements for the individual project components are based on rates for "stand-alone" land uses. These parking ratios therefore do not consider the concept of "shared parking" that occurs in developments containing a mix of land uses.

The shared parking theory recognizes that the peak parking accumulations for individual land uses occur at different times of the day, and that parking spaces can be shared by different uses at different times of the day and evening.

In the case of the proposed project, the office uses will generate the highest parking demands during the mid-day periods and the residential units have their highest demands during the early morning and evening periods, and the majority of visitors occur during the evening and weekend periods. The project parking lot therefore is used office uses during the day when many of the condominium residents are gone, and used by the condominium residents and guests at night after the office facilities are no longer in use.

The ITE Parking Generation[2] and the ULI Shared Parking Manual[3] provide specific procedures for computing the parking space needs for mixed-use sites with residences and commercial uses. The first step in completing the parking analysis is to calculate the gross project parking demands for each component. For this analysis, the following parking demand rates were used:

Medical Office. The average rate (50th percentile) presented in the ITE parking generation report for Medical-Dental Office are used for this analysis (3.53 spaces/1,000 S.F.). The rate applies to gross square-feet.

Condominiums. The average rate (50th percentile) presented in the ITE parking generation report for residential condominiums is 1.46 spaces/unit. However, the project proposes to reserve 2 spaces each for the 10 units. Thus a total of 20 spaces would be reserved for the 10 units, which is greater than the estimated demand.

Table 5 shows the parking demand calculations completed for the individual project components based on the rates reviewed above.

Table 5
Project Peak Parking Demand Calculations for Individual Components

Land Use	Size(a)	Rate	Parking Demand
Medical-Dental Office	8,400 S.F.	3.53 spaces/KSF	30 spaces
Condominiums	10 units	2 spaces/unit (b)	20 spaces
Total			**50 spaces**

(a) Gross square feet of building area

(b) Demand analysis assumes that 2 parking spaces will be reserved per unit.

The data presented in Table 5 show that the peak parking demand generated by the project would be 50 spaces. The 55 spaces proposed for the site would therefore accommodate the peak demand and would provide a 5-space parking reserve.

---

2 Parking Generation, Institute of Transportation Engineers, 3rd Edition, 2004

3 Shared Parking, Urban Land Institute, 1983.

This concludes the addendum to the traffic and parking study for the 1722 State Street Mixed-Use Project. Please contact our office if you have any questions regarding the contents of this report.

Associated Transportation Engineers

By: Scott A. Schell, AICP
Principal Transportation Planner

SAS/LDH