CALL TO ORDER:
Chair George C. Myers called the meeting to order at 1:00 P.M.

ROLL CALL:
Present:
Chair George C. Myers
Vice-Chair Stella Larson
Commissioners Bruce Bartlett, Addison S. Thompson and Harwood A. White, Jr.

Absent:
Commissioners Charmaine Jacobs and John Jostes

STAFF PRESENT:
David Gustafson, Acting Community Development Director
Bettie Weiss, City Planner
Jan Hubbell, AICP, Senior Planner
Pat Kelly, Assistant Public Works Director
N. Scott Vincent, Assistant City Attorney
Rob Dayton, Principal Transportation Planner
Steve Foley, Supervising Transportation Planner
Michael Berman, Environmental Analyst
Barbara Shelton, Environmental Analyst
Beatriz E. Gularte, Project Planner
Deana McMillion, Administrative/Clerical Supervisor
Julie Rodriguez, Planning Commission Secretary

I.  PRELIMINARY MATTERS:
   A. Requests for continuances, withdrawals, postponements, or addition of ex-agenda items.

      None.
B. Announcements and appeals.

Ms. Hubbell made the following announcements:

1. The 1236 San Andres Street project appeal will be heard by the City Council on March 11, 2008. Commissioner Myers will represent the Planning Commission.

2. The 517 Chapala Street project appeal will be heard by the City Council on March 4, 2008. Commissioner White will represent the Planning Commission.

3. The Architectural Board of Review’s preliminary review of the Santa Barbara Cottage Hospital Workforce Housing Project has been appealed to City Council and will be heard in late April. Planning Commission presence may be requested.

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

Chair Myers opened the public hearing at 1:06 P.M. and, with no one wishing to speak, closed the hearing.

II. NEW ITEMS:

ACTUAL TIME: 1:06 P.M.

A. APPLICATION OF LYNNEDEE ALTHOUSE AGENT FOR SOUTHERN PACIFIC RAILROAD, TENANT, 199 WEST MONTECITO STREET, 033-010-013, 037-010-024, AND 033-042-017, C-2/S-D-3 ZONE, GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: COMMERCIAL (MST#2008-00008/CDP#2008-00002)

The proposed project involves replacement of an existing deteriorated railroad bridge deck that supports the two railroad lines crossing Mission Creek. The new bridge deck would be narrower than the existing bridge. Therefore, the applicant has proposed to construct a similar appearing sandstone wall where the new deck would not cover the abutment resulting in the top 3 feet 3 inches of the wall being reconstructed.

The discretionary application required for this project is a Coastal Development Permit (SBMC § 28.44.060).

The Environmental Analyst has determined that the project is exempt from further environmental review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Guidelines Section 15302, Replacement of existing structures.

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

Staff answered questions about the new sandstone cap for the center stone pier; and the replacement railing on the north side; and project notification of construction hours for nearby residents.
Chair Myers opened the public hearing at 1:13 P.M. and, with no one wishing to speak, closed the hearing. Chair Myers read a public comment letter from Paula Westbury into the record expressing opposition to the project.

**MOTION: White/Thompson**

Assigned Resolution No. 007-08

Approve the Coastal Development Permit and Conditions of Approval for the replacement of the Union Pacific Bridge deck making the findings in the Staff Report with the added condition to require addition of sandstone to the center abutment to match the sandstone of the side abutments.

This motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 5  Noes: 0  Abstain: 0  Absent: 2 (Jacobs, Jostes)

Chair Myers announced the ten calendar day appeal period.

**ACTUAL TIME: 1:14 P.M.**


The proposed project involves construction of a six foot deep, 36 foot wide, and 90 foot long, concrete double box culvert beneath the two railroad lines at the western end of the Railroad Depot platform within the prior alignment for Chapala Street.

The discretionary application required for this project is a Coastal Development Permit (SBMC § 28.44.060).

The proposed project is consistent with the larger project analyzed in the certified Final Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report for the Lower Mission Creek Flood Control Project and findings must be made (CEQA Guidelines Section 15091) and a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program will be provided.

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

Michael Berman, Environmental Analyst, gave the Staff presentation.

Staff answered Planning Commission questions about impacts on the Morton Bay Fig Tree. Impacts are not anticipated due to its distance from the project.
Pat Kelly, Assistant Public Works Director, reported that grant funding was still being sought for the rest of the Lower Mission Creek Flood Control Project. All funding means are being researched.

Lynnedee Althouse, Union Pacific Railroad, responded to the Commission’s questions about construction logistics on the culvert project; construction dates that begin during the week of April 14, 2008; and coordination with Amtrak for train service during construction.

Chair Myers opened the public hearing at 1:31 P.M. and, with no one wishing to speak, closed the hearing. Chair Myers read into the record a letter from Paula Westbury in opposition to the project.

**MOTION: Bartlett/Thompson**  
Assigned Resolution No. 008-08  
Approve the project making the findings in the Staff Report for the Coastal Development Permit and subject to the Conditions of Approval in Exhibit A.

This motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 5  Noes: 0  Abstain: 0  Absent: 2 (Jacobs, Jostes)

Chair Myers announced the ten calendar day appeal period.

Chair Myers called for a recess at 1:45 P.M. and reconvened the hearing at 2:00 P.M.

### III. DISCUSSION ITEM:

**ACTUAL TIME: 2:00 P.M.**

**PLAN SANTA BARBARA UPDATE**
Planning Staff will present a status report on the progress of Plan Santa Barbara.  
Case Planner: John Ledbetter, Principal Planner

Bettie Weiss, City Planner, gave the Staff presentation.

Staff answered Planning Commission’s questions about the role of the Outreach Committee as Plan Santa Barbara moves forward; use of more frequent media releases; and potential support from the City Communications Committee.

One Commissioner encouraged Staff to conclude its deliberations before the annual Old Spanish Days Fiesta event in August.

Chair Myers opened the public hearing at 2:35 P.M. and the following people made public comments:
1. Judy Orias, Allied Neighborhoods Association, requested public comment be incorporated into the Plan Santa Barbara process design, including key issues and questions, and who makes the decisions.

2. Naomi Kovacs, Citizens Planning Association; member of the Outreach Committee, would like to see more interaction between staff, the Planning Commission and the community. Would like to see the three-member Planning Commission subcommittee included in the discussion groups; more public and media outreach; and inclusion of more youth in youth survey, beyond senior civics classes. Requested that the Development Trends Report be posted a minimum of ten days before workshops to allow for increased community input. Requested a community-wide survey.

3. Cathie McCammon, League of Women Voters, is pleased that the Planning Commission has helped revise the Plan Santa Barbara schedule. Would like to see economic plans added that include items such as the number of businesses in S.B, the impact of new businesses, etc.

With no one else wishing to speak, the public hearing was closed at 2:49 P.M.

Commissioner’s comments:

1. Some of the Commissioners expressed appreciation for the work that came out of early meetings with the subcommittee, with one Commissioner asking that Staff address pressing issues, such as the commercial areas and mixed use; follow-on to Measure E. Would like to see calculations on where we have been, where we are, and where are we going with mixed-use. Show this in the schedule

2. Coastal areas are a priority in terms of development. Coastal areas are primed for growth.

3. Would like to see annexations addressed. Look at density versus open space.

4. Some Commissioners felt that the M-1 zones need to be reviewed since the M-1 districts are the next area to be challenged by growth. Cited office buildings that can be built, yet do not meet the M-1 goals. M-1 uses becoming an endangered species.

5. Would like to see the Airport area included in the areas reviewed as it is also an area of potential growth.

6. One Commissioner would like to see more assurance that the EIR will update the baseline information for both the General Plan and the EIR.

7. One Commissioner would like to see a fresh look given to housing scenarios based on residential zones. The Housing Limits issue that was established in the past of 40,000+ residential units in the City was based on how much build-out could be obtained in current residential zones, but most of the new housing is happening in other zones. If Commercial zones are being used for residential
development, there needs to be an acknowledgment that we have other sources for residential development.

8. Some Commissioners agreed on the need to focus on workforce and housing issues. Should include how to continue the funding that the Regional Development Agency (RDA) has used to provide affordable housing. Would like to see employer-based housing moved to the forefront. There is a gap from where we have been to where we need to be going.

9. Good mapping is needed to look at where zones should be. The Central Business District was established years ago, but needs to be revisited. Need to look at what transit mechanisms need to be put in place; look at transit need.

10. Would like to see more public input and inclusion of neighboring municipalities. Notification should extend to the entire South Coast, North County and Ventura. Surveys should be available at commuter lots, Clean Air Express, and other areas to get commuter/employee input. Would like to see an evaluation of what are the unintended consequences and impacts of alternatives being considered. All the alternatives need to be tested the same way, including checking for their sustainability.

11. Need to discuss community benefit and what it is the community wants.

12. Should look at parking maximums, not just minimums, and whether we are developing for cars or people.

13. Identify new zones and where zones should be located or maps that can be helpful, such as those that include transit corridors.

14. The Commission acknowledged work being done by Staff and the subcommittee. Acknowledged that the public is not aware of all that is being done and encouraged reaching out to the public and sharing the process.

15. Maintain the long term vision versus the short term development concerns.

16. Would like to see how the Measure E sunset impacts the timeline. Would like to see visions done before ballot measures are scheduled.

17. Housing is a high priority; most of new housing will be in commercial zones; Housing task force needs to stay active, especially for employee housing. Address large gap between Regional Housing Needs Allocation numbers and what City has accomplished; something is amiss.

Ms. Weiss gave the Commission an update on mixed use from 1990-2007.

Ms. McCammon clarified a comment on the expectation of the release of the Development Trends Report. Ms. Weiss noted that the information will be made available to the public and the Planning Commission at the same time.

Barbara Shelton, Environmental Analyst, responded to the Commission’s questions about the Environmental Impact Report review process, noting the difference between a project EIR and a Program EIR. There will be interplay of policy options versus environmental
impacts. Ms. Weiss added that, at the time the EIR is being done, if there is something learned that can be included to the General Plan update, it will be considered.

Staff gave an update on the Land Use Element and Housing Element recommendations that are in progress as a result of the work sessions. Housing Element cannot be adopted until the EIR is certified.

Mr. Vincent addressed the ramifications in the delay in certification of the Housing Element.

Chair Myers thanked the Staff and the Community for its input.

IV. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

A. Committee and Liaison Reports.

1. Commissioner Larson reported on attending the Architectural Board of Review meeting. She informed the Commission that Stefanos Polyzoides will be coming to Santa Barbara on March 15, 2008 and speak at the Leni Fe Bland Auditorium at Santa Barbara Community College.

2. Commissioner Bartlett reported on attending the Architectural Board of Review and three significant items heard.

3. Commissioner Larson reported on attending the Ordinance Committee. Mr. Vincent added that the proposed Project Compatibility Analysis findings were reviewed.

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

Ms. Weiss gave a review of the upcoming Staff Hearing Officer appeals that will be heard by the Planning Commission.

V. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Myers adjourned the meeting at 4:18 P.M.

Submitted by,

[Signature]

Julie Rodriguez, Planning Commission Secretary