CALL TO ORDER:
Chair George C. Myers called the meeting to order at 1:05 P.M.

ROLL CALL:
Present:
Chair George C. Myers
Vice-Chair Stella Larson
Commissioners John Jostes and Addison S. Thompson

Absent:
Commissioners Bruce Bartlett, Charmaine Jacobs, and Harwood A. White, Jr.

STAFF PRESENT:
Jan Hubbell, Senior Planner
N. Scott Vincent, Assistant City Attorney
Rob Dayton, Principal Transportation Planner
Steve Foley, Supervising Transportation Planner
Peter Lawson, Associate Planner
Stacey Wilson, Associate Transportation Planner
Chelsey Swanson, Assistant Transportation Planner
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 announced that Debbie Hughey, Planning Technician, is leaving the City to work for the Montecito Sanitary District.
II. CONTINUED ITEM:

ACTUAL TIME: 1:06 P.M.
The following item was continued from March 13, 2008.

RECUALS: To avoid any perceived conflict of interest, the following Commissioners recused themselves from this hearing:

1. Commissioner Jacobs recused herself due to her husband’s law firm having represented the applicant in the past on an unrelated matter.
2. Commissioner White recused himself due to the applicant being a client of his for an extended period of time.
3. Commissioner Bartlett recused himself due to his architectural firm having the applicant as a client on a project in another city.

APPLICATION OF JEFF GORRELL ARCHITECT FOR JOHN PRICE,
APPLICANT, 1298 COAST VILLAGE ROAD, 009-230-043, C-1 & R-2 ZONES,
GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: GENERAL COMMERCIAL (MST2004-00493)

The proposed project involves the demolition of an existing gas station with two repair bays and the construction of a new mixed use building. The new 18,196 square foot mixed use building would be comprised of eight residential condominiums and approximately 5,000 square feet of commercial space, located on the ground floor. All of the residential units would be located on the second and third floors. Five residential units would include two bedrooms, two units would include one bedroom each and one unit would include three bedrooms. Approximately 38 parking spaces are provided, with nine covered parking spaces located at grade level and 29 parking spaces located below grade. Grading would be approximately 9,500 cubic yards of cut and 1,500 cubic yards of fill.

Currently, the 18,196 square-foot lot is split by two zoning designations; the northern portion, totaling approximately 7,150 square feet, is zoned R-2, and the southern portion, totaling about 11,046 square feet, is zoned C-1. The Planning Commission initiated rezoning the portion of the subject property zoned R-2 (Two Family Residential) to C-1 (Limited Commercial) on April 7, 2005. The entire property is located in the Coastal Overlay (SD-3) Zone, which would not change with this request.

The discretionary applications required for this project are:
1. A recommendation to City Council for Zoning Map Amendment to change the zoning from R-2, Two-Family Residential, to C-1, Commercial Zone District (SBMC §28.92.080.B);
2. A recommendation to the City Council for a Local Coastal Program Amendment to change the zoning to match the Local Coastal Plan designation of General Commerce.

3. A Modification to allow a portion of the building to encroach 7 feet into the required 17 foot northern interior yard setback (SBMC §28.92.110.A.2);

4. A Modification to allow the 10% common open space to be located above the ground floor level (SBMC §28.92.110.A.2);

5. A Modification to allow one second floor covered balcony to encroach 3 feet 6 inches into the 10 foot front yard setback on Coast Village Road (SBMC §28.92.110.A.2);

6. A Modification to allow the emergency stair way to encroach up to 9 feet 2 inches into the 10 foot front yard setback on Olive Mill Road (SBMC §28.92.110.A.2);

7. A Coastal Development Permit (CDP2005-00003) to allow the proposed development in the Non-Appealable Jurisdiction of the City’s Coastal Zone (SBMC §28.44.060);

8. A Development Plan to allow the construction of 5,000 square feet of nonresidential development (SBMC §28.87.300);

9. A Tentative Subdivision Map for a one-lot subdivision to create eight (8) residential condominium units and one (1) commercial unit (SBMC 27.07 and 27.13);

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

Case Planner: Peter Lawson, Associate Planner
Email: plawson@santabarbaraca.gov

Peter Lawson, Associate Planner, gave the staff presentation and outlined changes to the Conditions of Approval.

Staff responded to questions about where construction workers would park and the letter from the Montecito Water District.

Commissioners’ Comments:

1. The Commission has reviewed the project three times; thought the rezoning was appropriate then and continues to think so; the applicant responded well to the Concept review in 2006. Zoning needs to be consistent with the General Plan – standard of planning practice and theory; noted that the General Plan includes no buffer between the Commercial designation and adjacent property as is sometimes the case in other areas; also noted that C-1, Limited Commercial, Zone allows a lower density and intensity of uses and a lower height than the C-1, Commercial Zone in the Downtown; finally noted the allowed height is 45 feet and the applicant proposes 35 feet maximum height.
2. Reviewed the project against the Urban Design Guidelines and conclude the Guidelines are met and that project improves the relationship to Coast Village Road. Project is about the lowest three-story structure possible and architecture is to be commended. Project has great pedestrian scale and gracious architecture.

3. Commissioners agreed with the use of a Mitigated Negative Declaration, prepared using Master Environmental Assessment thresholds and methodologies consistently used by the City.

4. Commissioners agreed that the setback modification for the balcony is fine, noting that no modification would be required if it were not covered.

5. One Commissioner noted that a 60-year-old gas station is not the optimum use for the site.

6. Project will provide a real benefit by adding on-street parking along Coast Village Road.

7. Modification to allow some of the 10% open space requirement on the second floor is acceptable; however, the interior courtyard does push square footage to the street and increases the bulk of the building.

8. Two Commissioners indicated the setback modification on Olive Mill Road is questionable, especially where the stair turns.

9. One Commissioner also stated the northerly setback should be met on at least the second floor and, preferably, the first floor too.

10. One Commissioner supported some setback modification on the north side, but not as much as proposed.

11. One Commissioner expressed concern about trash pickup and bus stop on Olive Mill Road near a busy intersection.

12. One Commissioner suggested that the tower be moved to the west side and indicated support for a four-story element.

**STRAW VOTE: Jostes**
Approve a **Modification** of the northern setback.

This motion failed by the following vote:

Ayes: 2  Noes: 2 (Jostes, Thompson)  Abstain: 0  Absent: 3 (Bartlett, Jacobs, White)

**STRAW VOTE: Thompson**
Approve a **Modification** to allow the emergency stair way to encroach up to 9 feet 2 inches into the 10 foot front yard setback on Olive Mill Road.

This motion failed by the following vote:

Ayes: 1  Noes: 3 (Myers, Jostes, Thompson)  Abstain: 0  Absent: 3 (Bartlett, Jacobs, White)
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**MOTION: Thompson/Jostes**  
Assigned Resolution No. 012-08  
Approve the project, making the findings in the Staff Report and Conditions of Approval, with the modifications excluding modification #6 for the emergency stairway on Olive Mill Road and return to the Architectural Board of Review for a redesign of the Olive Mill Road elevation.

This motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 3  Noes: 1 (Myers)  Abstain: 0  Absent: 3 (Bartlett, Jacobs, White)

Chair Myers voted against the motion because the Olive Mill elevation made too drastic a transition into the neighborhood.

Chair Myers announced the ten calendar day appeal period.

Mr. Fell asked for clarification of the motion by the Commission.

III. **ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA**

**MOTION: Larson/Thompson**  
Continue the Administrative Agenda to April 10, 2008 for a complete Commission.

This motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 4  Noes: 0  Abstain: 0  Absent: 3 (Bartlett, Jacobs, White)

IV. **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Myers adjourned the meeting at 1:56 P.M.

Submitted by,

[Signature]

Julie Rodriguez, Planning Commission Secretary