I. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project involves the demolition of an existing 1,965 net square-foot, single story office building and the construction of a two and three story, mixed-use building containing 10 commercial condominiums totaling 4,838 square feet and six residential condominiums. The residential unit mix would be one two-bedroom unit and five three-bedroom units. The units would range in size from 1,316 net square feet to 2,249 net square feet. The 10 commercial units are proposed to be approximately 400 square feet each and could be combined to result in varying unit sizes. Twenty-seven parking spaces are provided in an underground parking garage, with 11 of the spaces allocated through a private parking agreement to the adjacent property at 223 E. De la Guerra Street. Vehicle access to the underground parking garage would be via De la Guerra Street (Exhibits B and C).

II. REQUIRED APPLICATIONS

The discretionary applications required for this project are:

1. A Development Plan to allow the construction of 2,873 net new square feet of nonresidential development (SBMC §28.87.300); and
2. A Tentative Subdivision Map for a one-lot subdivision to create ten (10) commercial condominiums and six (6) residential condominium units (SBMC§27.07 and 27.13).

III. RECOMMENDATION

The proposed project conforms to the City’s Zoning and Building Ordinances and policies of the General Plan. In addition, the size and massing of the project are consistent with the surrounding neighborhood. Therefore, Staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve the project, making the findings outlined in Section VIII of this report, and subject to the conditions of approval in Exhibit A.
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APPLICATION DEEMED COMPLETE: February 29, 2008
DATE ACTION REQUIRED PER MAP ACT: August 17, 2008 (with 90 day extension agreed to by the applicant)
IV. SITE INFORMATION AND PROJECT STATISTICS

A. SITE INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant: 800 Santa Barbara Street, LLC</th>
<th>Property Owner: 800 Santa Barbara Street, LLC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parcel Number: 031-012-028</td>
<td>Lot Area: 18,586 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Plan: Major Public &amp; Institutional/Offices</td>
<td>Zoning: C-2, Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Use: Commercial</td>
<td>Topography: 4% slope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent Land Uses:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North – Anacapa School</td>
<td>East – Commercial Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South – De la Guerra Street</td>
<td>West – Santa Barbara Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. RESIDENTIAL STATISTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Units</th>
<th># of Bedrooms</th>
<th>Unit Size (net)</th>
<th>Private Outdoor Living Space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Unit 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,316 sq. ft.</td>
<td>376 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Unit 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,580 sq. ft.</td>
<td>703 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Unit 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,580 sq. ft.</td>
<td>472 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Unit 4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,580 sq. ft.</td>
<td>160 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Unit 5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,592 sq. ft.</td>
<td>131 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Unit 6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,249 sq. ft.</td>
<td>345 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. ZONING ORDINANCE CONSISTENCY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Requirement/ Allowance</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C-2 Setbacks</td>
<td>C-2=4 stories/60'</td>
<td>69'-150' front yard (Santa Barbara)</td>
<td>6'-30' front yard (Santa Barbara)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Front</td>
<td>None Required</td>
<td>89'-127' front yard (De la Guerra)</td>
<td>13'-44' front yard (De la Guerra)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Interior</td>
<td></td>
<td>5'-127' interior yard (north)</td>
<td>3.5'-10' interior yard (north)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Rear</td>
<td></td>
<td>5'-150' rear yard (east)</td>
<td>0'-32' rear yard (east)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Height</td>
<td>C-2=4 stories/60'</td>
<td>1 story/Approx. 13'</td>
<td>2 stories with 3rd story element</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% Open Space</td>
<td>1,859 sq. ft.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7,985 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>Commercial = 10 spaces</td>
<td>22 spaces</td>
<td>Residential=6 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residential = 6 spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial=10 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total = 16 spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lease agrmt=11 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total = 27 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area Required for Each Unit (Variable Density)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Required = 16,320 sq. ft. Provided = 18,586 sq. ft.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Bdrm = 1,840 sq. ft.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Bdrm = 2,320 sq. ft.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Bdrm = 2,800 sq. ft.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Two-Bdrm = 2,320 sq. ft.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Three-Bdrm = 2,800 sq. ft.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total = 16,320 sq. ft.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Outdoor Living Space</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Unit 1 = 378 sq. ft.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72 sq. ft. = 1 bdrm</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unit 2 = 708 sq. ft.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84 sq. ft. = 2 bdrms</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unit 3 = 472 sq. ft.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96 sq. ft. = 3+ bdrms</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unit 4 = 160 sq. ft.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Coverage Building</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Unit 5 = 131 sq. ft.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paving/Driveway</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Unit 6 = 345 sq. ft.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,398 sq. ft. 12.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,186 sq. ft. 38.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9,002 sq. ft. 48.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,043 sq. ft. 43.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,416 sq. ft. 34.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,127 sq. ft. 22.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed project would meet the requirements of the C-2 Zone. Modifications are not required by this project.

A. PARKING

The property is located within the Central Business District (CBD), which has a requirement of one parking space per 500 square feet of nonresidential square footage. The residential parking requirement is one uncovered space per residential unit, with no guest parking requirement. As such, the Zoning Ordinance would require that six parking spaces be provided for the proposed residential condominiums and 10 spaces for the proposed 4,838 square feet of commercial space (4,838 sq. ft./500 sq. ft. = 9.6 spaces). A total of 16 parking spaces would be required for the mixed-use development. In response to Staff's request to not exceed the Zoning Ordinance requirement for the number of parking spaces, the project provides one space per residential unit and also provides 10 spaces for the commercial portion of the project. According to the applicant, there is a private lease agreement with the adjacent property at 223 E. De la Guerra Street to provide 11 parking spaces. Although not required, these spaces will be maintained and included as part of the project, for a total of 27 spaces.

B. RESIDENTIAL CONDOMINIUM DEVELOPMENT

The project would be consistent with the general City requirements and physical standards for new condominium development, per SBMC §27.13.050 and §27.13.060, respectively. The project would provide the required covered parking, 300 cubic feet of private storage space and laundry facilities for each unit. Each unit would have its own utility meters, and all utilities are proposed to be underground. Each unit would also meet the requirements for private outdoor living space.
C. **Measure E**

The project includes the construction of approximately 4,838 square feet of commercial space, which requires the approval of a Development Plan. Pursuant to the provisions of SBMC §28.87.300, the project site is provided with 2,000 square feet of Measure E nonresidential square footage from the Small Addition category and 1,000 square feet from the Minor Addition category for a total of 3,000 square feet. The project would receive a demolition credit of 1,965 square feet for the existing commercial building that is proposed to be removed as part of the project. Therefore this proposal would require approximately 2,873 Measure E nonresidential square footage (4,838 SF proposed – 1,965 SF demolished = 2,873 SF).

VI. **ISSUES**

A. **Design Review**

This project’s design and architecture was reviewed by the HLC on three separate occasions (meeting minutes are attached as Exhibit D). On October 4, 2006, the Commission found the architecture generally acceptable, but felt that the size, bulk and scale should be reduced to provide a buffer from the properties to the north and east. HLC directed the applicant to consider the proposed building’s proximity to the “possible future reconstruction and expansion of the Presidio in its context to a historic state park”. The Commission asked that landscaping be maximized, including the incorporation of skyline trees and significant vegetation on the courtyard. The HLC expressed support for any reduction in public paving, including the realignment of the corner with the proposed bulb-out. As part of the public comment, a representative from Anacapa School expressed concern regarding the setbacks on the northern property line and the proposed residential balconies overlooking the school yard. Representatives from the Trust for Historic Preservation expressed concern regarding the project’s effect on the future Phase III reconstruction plans for El Presidio. Concern was also raised regarding the potential adverse effects on the adjacent Neighborhood House building.

On November 15, 2006, the HLC stated that the proposal was improved. The HLC appreciated the axial layout and felt that it was appropriate. However, some HLC members felt that the narrowest part of the throat on the central axis should be “opened up”. Several Commissioners felt that the northwest corner of the proposed building should be set back more than six feet. Several public members and adjacent neighbors provided comments to the HLC regarding the historic neighborhood surrounding the project site, the importance of the Neighborhood House located at 223 E. De la Guerra Street, and the restored Presidio. Representatives from the Anacapa School located adjacent to the project site expressed concern regarding potential student noise complaints from future residents of the proposed project. Student safety during construction was also identified as a concern.

On January 10, 2007, the HLC provided positive comments, stating that they liked the project “as a whole”. In particular, the HLC was pleased with the manner in which the corner was addressed, including the landscape screen, how the building was pulled back from the Anacapa School and the change in use on the northern property line adjacent to the school from residential to commercial. The HLC asked the applicant to not roof the bridge (connecting the
north and south portions of the building), to lower plate heights to the extent possible in order to accurately mimic the Monterey style, to reuse the existing brick paving, and to keep paving simple and rustic to be consistent with the Monterey style. A representative from Anacapa School expressed appreciation regarding the change in use along the northern property line from residential to commercial, but stated that concerns regarding safety, access to school’s parking and disruption of school activities during construction still remain. Please see discussion below under noise and traffic that addresses concerns raised regarding Anacapa School.

B. **UNIT SIZE**

With respect to the Planning Commission’s informal guideline that residential condominium unit sizes be limited to 85% of the lot area required under variable density, the table below shows that all the proposed units would comply with this guideline.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Number</th>
<th>Proposed Unit Size (net square feet)</th>
<th>85% of Lot Area</th>
<th>Complies with 85% Guideline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit 1</td>
<td>1,316 sq. ft.</td>
<td>1,972 sq. ft.</td>
<td>complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 2</td>
<td>1,580 sq. ft.</td>
<td>2,380 sq. ft.</td>
<td>complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 3</td>
<td>1,580 sq. ft.</td>
<td>2,380 sq. ft.</td>
<td>complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 4</td>
<td>1,580 sq. ft.</td>
<td>2,380 sq. ft.</td>
<td>complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 5</td>
<td>1,592 sq. ft.</td>
<td>2,380 sq. ft.</td>
<td>complies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit 6</td>
<td>2,249 sq. ft.</td>
<td>2,380 sq. ft.</td>
<td>complies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. **COMPLIANCE WITH THE GENERAL PLAN**

Before a condominium project and a tentative map can be approved, they must be found consistent with the City’s General Plan. The project site is located in the Laguna Neighborhood, which is an area of mixed commercial, educational and cultural uses.

**Land Use Element:** The General Plan designation for this property is Office and Major Public & Institutional; residential uses are also allowed in areas so designated. As such, the residential portion of the mixed-use development would be subject to the density requirements of the R-3/R-4 (Multiple Family Residential) Zone, which allows 12 dwelling units to the acre. The Land Use Element of the General Plan recognizes, however, that in zones where variable density standards apply, development may exceed the limit of twelve units per acre. With the application of variable density standards, the proposed condominium development would result in a density of approximately 14.06 dwelling units per acre. Therefore, the project would be consistent with the General Plan in this regard.

**Housing Element:** The City Housing Element encourages construction of a wide range of housing types to meet the needs of various household types. This proposal would satisfy that goal through the mix of unit types proposed.

A goal of the Housing Element is to assist in the production of new housing opportunities, through the public and private sector, which vary sufficiently in type and affordability to meet
the needs of all economic and social groups. Additionally, Santa Barbara has very little vacant or available land for new infill residential development, and, therefore, the City has supported build-out of housing units in the City’s urban areas where individual projects are deemed appropriate and compatible. The provision of two and three-bedroom units, ranging from 1,316 to 2,249 square feet in size, would provide some variability in the additional housing stock being provided by this project.

**Neighborhood Compatibility:** In accordance with Housing Element Policy 3.3, which requires new development to be compatible with the prevailing character of the neighborhood, the proposed building would be compatible in scale, size and design with the surrounding neighborhood.

One of the goals of the Urban Design Guidelines is compatibility of new development with the character of the City, the surrounding neighborhood, and adjacent properties. The Historic Landmarks Commission considers the Urban Design Guidelines in reviewing development proposals. As discussed above, the HLC was supportive of the mass, bulk, and scale of the proposal, and while some project details still need studying as part of subsequent design review, they are supportive of the development of this project in this neighborhood.

Because De la Guerra Street shifts several feet to the south at its intersection with Santa Barbara Street, the view from State Street down De la Guerra Street is qualitatively different than other Downtown streets. Instead of being an ongoing street corridor with buildings on both sides, this corridor is interrupted by a heavily vegetated site with gracious setbacks for the existing building. Due to this configuration, this corner of the intersection is particularly prominent. Additional development of this site must be carefully designed given the uniqueness and openness of the site. While the incorporation of the existing agaves and historically used trees are intended to retain the vegetated character of the existing project site, the change from a substantially vegetated corner with an existing single story building which is set back a considerable distance from both Santa Barbara and De la Guerra Streets, to a predominately two-story building which dominates the street frontages, would effect the visual uniqueness and openness of this corner.

The surrounding neighborhood is comprised of a mix of office, residential, and commercial buildings, which range from one to three stories in height. Adjacent to the project site on the west is Santa Barbara Street, Anacapa School on the north, a commercial/office building on the east and De la Guerra Street on the south. The maximum height of the proposed structure would be approximately 37.5 feet, which is comparable with other three-story structures in the surrounding neighborhood. Additionally, the building can be considered compatible with the architectural style of surrounding buildings.

While staff does have some concerns about the change from views of heavy vegetation to views that include more buildings, mountain views would remain substantially similar to the existing views (see discussion in Environmental Review below). In addition, the project proposes vegetation along both street frontages. Thus, the project can be found consistent with the type and massing of surrounding development in the neighborhood.
Circulation Element: The Circulation Element contains goals and policies that promote housing in and adjacent to the downtown to facilitate the use of alternative modes of transportation and to reduce the use of the automobile. For example, Circulation Element Implementation Strategy 13.1.1 encourages “the development of projects that combine and locate residential uses near areas of employment and services.” This project provides housing as well as commercial space in the downtown and is, therefore, consistent with this goal.

Intersection improvements at the corner of Santa Barbara and De la Guerra Streets are intended to provide pedestrian site visibility at the crosswalk located in front of the project, which is currently limited due to the off-set configuration of this intersection. The proposed bulb-out at the corner along the property frontage would square off this corner thereby promoting pedestrian safety. The bulb-out would shorten the pedestrian crossing and require vehicular traffic to make more of a 90 degree turn from De la Guerra Street on to Santa Barbara Street. Additional public improvements, including directional ramps, sidewalks and wider parkways would serve to enhance the pedestrian experience. These elements of the proposed project would be consistent with the goals of the Circulation Element and Pedestrian Master Plan.

D. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

Cultural Resources – Archaeological: The project site is located within four sensitivity zones for archaeological resources. A Phase I Archaeological Resource Survey was prepared by Stone Archaeological Consulting in January 2007 and accepted by the HLC on February 7, 2007. The study concluded that the potential to encounter unknown but potentially significant subsurface prehistoric remains (intact and not subject to previous ground disturbance) is unlikely. However, there is the potential that intact isolated historic trash pits dating to the Spanish-Colonial era could be present. These resources would be considered potentially historic under state and local criteria, and impacts to such resources would be potentially significant. Based on this, the report identifies measures intended to reduce potential significant impacts to unknown intact historic archaeological features such as trash pits associated with the Santa Barbara Presidio. A condition of approval has been included to require the implementation of these measures.

Recently, the Trust for Historic Preservation expressed concern regarding the potential for encountering undisturbed trash pits associated with the Presidio-era on the project site. In order to further reduce the potential for encountering these resources during construction, the Trust requested that subsurface archaeological excavations be undertaken prior to ground disturbance. In response to this request, 10 shovel test pits were performed at the project site on May 8th and 9th under the direction of the project archaeologist, David Stone of Dudek. The shovel test pit excavation did not produce any evidence of a pit or refuse area associated with the occupation of the Presidio or the Teodoro Arrellanes adobe. Therefore, the findings associated with this investigation do not change the conclusions of the previously HLC approved Phase 1 Archeological Report (Stone Archaeological Consulting 2007) and further mitigation is not required.

Cultural Resources – Historic Resources: Due to the project’s potential to adversely impact existing historic resources adjacent to the project site and in the surrounding neighborhood,
Staff requested that a Historic Structures Report (HSR) be prepared that analyzed the historic significance of the existing building proposed to be demolished, the relocation of the flagpole, the brick pathway and stairs, the sandstone walls and vegetation, and the adjacent historic structure located at 223 E. Del la Guerra Street. Staff also requested that the relationship of the proposed project with the Rochin Adobe (820 Santa Barbara Street) and its effect on the context of the adobe be addressed in the HSR.

A Phase 1 Historic Structures Report was prepared by Preservation Planning Associates in August 2006 and accepted by the HLC on October 4, 2006 (Exhibit E). The report concluded that the office building at 800 Santa Barbara Street is not considered eligible as a Structure of Merit or Landmark and therefore, its demolition would not result in a significant historic resources impact. However, the sandstone wall at the perimeter of the project site was determined to be eligible as a Structure of Merit. The wall is considered a familiar and established feature at this corner, dating to the 1920's and considered a part of the old Neighborhood House landscaping. In addition, the existing landscaping associated with the project site contributes to the visual character of the neighborhood. The individual trees on the property are not considered significant, but the report states that the extensive landscaping has become a familiar visual feature of the streetscape and therefore was considered in the analysis of the potential impacts of the project.

There are a number of Landmark adobes (Historic and Covarrubias adobes, Historical Society Building, etc.), as well as other buildings on the City’s potential list in the surrounding area. Although the report stated that the proposed building would not impact these historic buildings because the project site is sufficiently removed from them, the HLC required that this statement be changed to reflect that the proposed building’s presence as a “larger-scale building may impact these historic buildings”. However, the project’s impacts are considered to be less than significant.

The Rochin adobe is located two doors down from the project site and other historic buildings are at least a block away on De la Guerra Street. Adjacent to the east of the project site is 223 E. De la Guerra Street, considered a potentially significant building. The HSR concludes that the proposed project is compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale, proportions and massing of the adjacent building at 223 E. De la Guerra and therefore the project would not result in a significant impact on this building.

The perimeter sandstone wall is proposed to be retained and incorporated into the project design. The existing flagpole at the east end of the walkway would be preserved, and the existing brick walkway would be reused. The report acknowledges the existing landscaping that would be retained as well as the new plantings that are proposed, but recommends that the black acacia tree that is pushing the perimeter wall out of alignment be removed. It also recommends that all new planting be set back sufficiently, so they do not damage the wall. The report also directs that, where it is necessary to cut through the sandstone wall for new uses, that the existing configuration of the wall be copied.

On March 21, 2007, the HLC reviewed and accepted a letter addendum to the HSR previously prepared for the subject property (Exhibit F). The addendum addressed the potential historic resources impacts that could occur due to project revisions. The addendum states that the
Rochin adobe and the former Neighborhood House (223 E. De la Guerra Street) could be potentially impacted by the project. However, because the redesign incorporates features that are considered sensitive and compatible with both these buildings, impacts would be less than significant and additional mitigation is not required.

**Hazardous Materials:** According to a letter dated October 12, 2007, from the Santa Barbara County Fire Department, file review of the project address indicated that shallow groundwater beneath the site may be contaminated with chlorinated solvents (Exhibit G). Due to the presence of these chemicals, the Fire Department recommended that conditions of approval be imposed requiring that, prior to building permit issuance, the applicant either perform a soil vapor survey and human health assessment or develop an engineered control to mitigate potential vapor intrusion into any planned on-site building. The applicant has incorporated provisions for either of these recommendations into their project description. A condition of approval requiring Fire Department review and acceptance of the soil vapor survey and human risk assessment or an engineered control has been included.

**Visual Resources:** During the application review process, Staff expressed concerns regarding the change in massing that would result from the proposed project, as well as potentially adverse impacts to the existing streetscape along Santa Barbara and De la Guerra Streets. Staff requested that the applicant provide a visual representation of the streetscape changes in order to understand the mass, bulk, and scale in relationship to neighboring properties and the changes to surrounding mountain views. Photo simulations were prepared to assist staff in determining whether the proposed mixed-use building would result in visual aesthetic issues related to the potential blockage of the Santa Ynez Mountains, as well as the removal of substantial amounts of vegetation on the project site.

Based on the photo simulations of the proposed building (Exhibit H), and specifically the simulation showing the vantage point from mid block on De la Guerra Street, between Anacapa and Santa Barbara Streets, Staff concluded that view blockage of the mountains by the proposed project would not be substantial enough to result in a significant visual impact. Although the existing character of the Santa Barbara/De la Guerra Street corner would be changed with respect to mountain views, it was determined that the two and three story building would not substantially obstruct the existing mountain view. It should be noted, that the mountains are currently obscured with the large acacia tree located at the foreground on Santa Barbara Street. With the planned removal of this tree, the mountain range would be more visible even with the proposed building massing.

The majority of the existing trees are proposed to be removed due to the scope of the project. Only three trees would remain in place and four would be relocated on site. However, the agaves currently existing on the perimeter of the project site would remain and proposed landscaping would include historically used California Pepper and Olive trees.

**Infill Exemption (CEQA Section 15332)**

The Guidelines of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) include a number of types of projects that are generally exempt from environmental review. Staff and the Environmental Analyst have determined that the project qualifies for an exemption per CEQA
Section 15332 which provides for in-fill development projects in urban areas where it is determined that there will be no significant effects as identified by the following criteria:

1. The project is consistent with the applicable General Plan designation and all applicable General Plan policies as well as with applicable zoning designation regulations.

The General Plan designation for this area is Office and Major Public & Institutional. As discussed above, there are several General Plan policies as well as zoning regulations that apply to the project. Planning Staff’s conclusion is that the project is consistent with the General Plan Land Use Designation, Zoning designation, and applicable policies and regulations.

2. The proposed development occurs within city limits on a project of no more than five acres substantially surrounded by urban uses

The lot size of the project site is 18,586 square feet (0.43 acre) and is within the city limits. The project area is urban and developed with a mix of commercial, office, cultural and educational uses.

3. The project site has no value as habitat for endangered, rare or threatened species.

The site has been previously disturbed and has no value as habitat for endangered, rare or threatened species.

4. Approval of the project would not result in any significant effects relating to traffic, noise, air quality, or water quality.

a. Traffic

The applicant provided a trip generation and intersection impact analysis, prepared by Associated Transportation Engineers (ATE), dated September 12, 2007 (Exhibit I). The study estimated that the proposed project would generate approximately 13 net new AM peak hour trips, 14 net new PM peak hour trips, and 106 net new average daily trips compared with the existing development. This trip generation was based on gross square footages of new floor area, consistent with the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) methodology. The study also provided a level of service (LOS) analysis for both signalized intersections and unsignalized intersections at four different intersections near the project site.

The City of Santa Barbara has established the following threshold criteria to determine if a project has a significant traffic impact:

- A project-specific significant impact is deemed to have occurred if a development project would cause the volume-to-capacity (V/C) ratio at an intersection to exceed 0.77, or if the project would increase the V/C ratio at intersections which already exceed 0.77 by 0.01.
- A cumulative project significant impact is deemed to have occurred if a development project would add traffic to an intersection which is forecast to operate above $V/C = 0.77$ with cumulative traffic volumes.

The City’s practice is to follow five trips in any direction to or from a site to determine compliance with the cumulative threshold. Once less than five trips are determined to be headed in any one direction, distribution (or “following”) of these trips ceases because Staff cannot state with statistical certainty where these trips would be headed on a daily basis.

The ATE study provided a trip distribution analysis, comparing the existing AM and PM peak hour volumes to the existing plus project AM and PM peak hour traffic volumes. Based on the trip distribution of the net new trips associated with the project, it is estimated that the project would not exceed the City’s standard threshold that would result in traffic impacts to the nearby intersections. Thus, the Transportation Division anticipates that this project would not generate project-specific or cumulative traffic impacts.

b. **Noise**

According to the City’s Master Environmental Assessment (MEA), the project site is located in an area of noise levels between 60-65 dBA (decibels). The required private outdoor living spaces for the residential units must not be exposed to noise levels in excess of 60 dBA. The acoustical analysis prepared for the project identifies traffic on Santa Barbara Street and to a lesser extent the traffic on De la Guerra Street as the primary noise contributors (Exhibit J). Noise associated with the Anacapa School to the north of the property usually occurs during recess activities in the school yard and other outdoor activities. The analysis concludes that all outdoor living spaces for the units would be below 60 dBA. Therefore, potential exterior noise impacts to the residential units are expected to be less than significant.

The Anacapa School is considered the most sensitive receptor that would be affected by project construction noise. The construction period for the project is expected to be approximately 52 weeks. The report states that the highest noise potential is expected to occur within the first five weeks of construction. The average noise levels would range from 60 to 70 dBA at the school yard. These levels have the potential to interfere with normal school yard activities. To mitigate this potential noise impact, the report recommends the use of noise control blankets as noise barriers. This measure is expected to reduce noise levels below 60 dBA, and therefore construction noise impacts to the adjacent school are expected to be less than significant. A condition of approval has been included to require the use of noise control blanket/curtain with a Sound Transmission Class (STC) rating of 25.

c. **Air Quality**

The City of Santa Barbara uses the Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District’s (APCD) thresholds of significance for air quality impacts. Based on the APCD’s Land Use Screening Table, a project of six residential units and 4,838 square
feet of commercial space would not result in significant air quality impacts. Due to the fact that the project is much smaller than those identified on the table, it is expected that there would be less than significant air quality impacts from mobile source emissions.

The project would involve demolition, grading, paving and landscaping activities which could result in short term dust related impacts; however, the applicant would be required to incorporate standard dust control mitigation measures during grading and construction activities. These measures are included as conditions of approval and would further reduce less than significant air quality impacts.

d. Water Quality

The project site is currently developed with urban uses and is subject to the City’s Storm Water Management Plan. The project proposes a detention basin to retain storm water runoff. The proposed detention facility would have adequate capacity to retain a 100 year storm event and is expected to decrease storm water runoff below pre-development levels. The detention facility would delay runoff from leaving the site allowing time for the contaminants to be broken down by vegetation and sunlight, thereby improving runoff water quality. A condition of approval is included that requires that the first inch of runoff be treated on-site and that the runoff be directed into passive water treatment facilities, such as bioswales and landscape features. With the implementation of this condition, the proposed project would have less than significant impacts on water quality.

5. The site can be adequately served by all required utilities and public services.

All utilities are existing and available at the site and can be extended to the development. The proposed project would result in an insignificant increase in demand for public services, including police, fire protection, electrical power, natural gas and water distribution and treatment.

VII. CONCLUSION

As discussed in this Staff Report, this project can be found consistent with the requirements of the C-2 zone and applicable policies of the City’s General Plan. The proposed development would not result in adverse impacts to the environment and would provide infill mixed-use development in the Downtown area. In addition, the project has been reviewed by the HLC and found to be appropriate for the property and compatible with the surrounding neighborhood. While Staff can support the project, concerns remain regarding the change that would result to this particular project site, which is located in an area characterized by a large number of historic buildings. The subject property sits on a corner which is heavily vegetated and distinctively configured, making it visibly prominent. The removal of the existing vegetation, which has been determined by the HSR to be a character defining feature of the project site, and the development of a larger-scale building set back considerably less than the existing building, will result in a changed character for this corner.
VIII. FINDINGS

The Planning Commission finds the following:

A. **The Tentative Map (SBMC §27.07.100)**

The Tentative Subdivision Map is consistent with the General Plan and the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Santa Barbara. The site is physically suitable for the proposed development, the project is consistent with the variable density provisions of the Municipal Code and the General Plan, and the proposed use is consistent with the vision for this neighborhood of the General Plan. The design of the project will not cause substantial environmental damage, and associated improvements will not cause serious public health problems.

B. **The New Condominium Development (SBMC §27.13.080)**

1. There is compliance with all provisions of the City’s Condominium Ordinance.
   
   *The project complies with density requirements. Each unit includes laundry facilities, separate utility metering, adequate unit size and storage space, and the required private outdoor living space.*

2. The proposed development is consistent with the General Plan of the City of Santa Barbara.
   
   *The project is consistent with policies of the City’s General Plan including the Land Use Element, Housing Element, Conservation Element, Noise Element and Circulation Element. The proposed development is consistent with the principles of sound community planning and will not have an adverse impact upon the neighborhood’s aesthetics, parks, streets, traffic, parking and other community facilities and resources. The project will provide infill residential and commercial development in the downtown that is compatible with the surrounding neighborhood.*

3. The proposed development is consistent with the principles of sound community planning and will not have an adverse impact upon the neighborhood’s aesthetics, parks, streets, traffic, parking and other community facilities and resources.
   
   *The project is an infill mixed-use project proposed in an area where residential and commercial development is a permitted use. The project is adequately served by public streets, will provide adequate parking to meet the demands of the project and will not result in traffic impacts. Adequate park facilities exist nearby, and the project would not adversely impact other community resources, such as water, sewer, police, fire, and schools. The design has been reviewed by the City’s design review board, which found the architecture and site design appropriate.*
C. FOR THE DEVELOPMENT PLAN (SBMC §28.87.300)

1. The proposed development complies with all provisions of the Zoning Ordinance.

The proposed development complies with all provisions of the Zoning Ordinance, specifically the provisions of the C-2, Commercial Zone designation.

2. The proposed development is consistent with the principles of sound community planning.

The project site is located in the Land Use Element's Laguna Neighborhood and has a General Plan Designation of Major Public & Institutional and Offices and a Zoning Designation of C-2, Commercial. The Laguna Neighborhood is developed with single-family dwellings, duplexes, and higher-density multiple units in the eastern and northern portions and mixed residential and commercial uses on the west as it merges with the downtown. The project is a mixed-use proposal and represents an infill development on the subject site. It would allow for additional residential units and commercial spaces in the Downtown area, and is consistent with the existing mix of uses in the surrounding neighborhood. Parcels immediately adjacent to the site are developed with commercial, cultural and educational uses.

3. The proposed development will not have a significant adverse impact upon the neighborhood's aesthetics/character in that the size, bulk or scale of the development will be compatible with the neighborhood.

The HLC conceptually reviewed the project and found the design and land use to be appropriate. The project is compatible with the surrounding area's aesthetics and character and is consistent with other two and three-story commercial and mixed-use buildings in the immediate area. The project is also consistent with the Urban Design Guidelines.

4. The proposed development would not have a significant unmitigated adverse impact upon City and South Coast affordable housing stock.

The proposed project would contribute six units to the City and South Coast housing stock and thus, would result in a positive impact to the region's housing stock.

5. The proposed development will not have a significant unmitigated adverse impact on the City's water resources.

The proposed project is estimated to demand 2.26 AFY, which would not significantly impact the City's water supply. There is adequate water to meet the needs of the proposed development. The proposed project receives water service from the City of Santa Barbara and is within the anticipated growth rate for the City. Therefore, the City's long-term water supply and existing water
treatment and distribution facilities would adequately serve the proposed project.

6. The proposed development will not have a significant unmitigated adverse impact on the City's traffic.

Transportation Staff has reviewed the project and determined that the project would not result in significant project or cumulative impacts to any impacted intersection.

Exhibits:
A. Conditions of Approval
B. Site Plan
C. Applicant's letter dated February 6, 2008
D. HLC Minutes
E. Historic Structures Report dated August 2006
G. County of Santa Barbara Fire Department letter dated October 12, 2007
H. Photo-Simulations
PRELIMINARY
PLANNING COMMISSION CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

800 SANTA BARBARA STREET
DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP
MAY 22, 2008

In consideration of the project approval granted by the Planning Commission and for the benefit of the owner(s) and occupant(s) of the Real Property, the owners and occupants of adjacent real property and the public generally, the following terms and conditions are imposed on the use, possession, and enjoyment of the Real Property:

A. **Recorded Agreement.** Prior to the issuance of any Public Works permit or Building permit for the project on the Real Property, the Owner shall execute an *Agreement Relating to Subdivision Map Conditions Imposed on Real Property*, which shall be reviewed as to form and content by the City Attorney, Community Development Director and Public Works Director, recorded in the Office of the County Recorder, and shall include the following:

1. **Approved Development.** The development of the Real Property approved by the Planning Commission on May 22, 2008 is limited to six residential condominium units and up to 2,873 new square feet of commercial development that may be subdivided into as many as 10 commercial condominium units and the improvements shown on the Tentative Subdivision Map signed by the chairman of the Planning Commission on said date and on file at the City of Santa Barbara.

2. **Uninterrupted Water Flow.** The Owner shall provide for the uninterrupted flow of water through the Real Property including, but not limited to, swales, natural watercourses, conduits and any access road, as appropriate.

3. **Recreational Vehicle Storage Prohibition.** No recreational vehicles, boats, or trailers shall be stored on the Real Property.

4. **Landscape Plan Compliance.** The Owner shall comply with the Landscape Plan approved by the Historic Landmarks Commission (HLC). Such plan shall not be modified unless prior written approval is obtained from the (HLC). The landscaping on the Real Property shall be provided and maintained in accordance with said landscape plan. If said landscaping is removed for any reason without approval by the HLC, the owner is responsible for its immediate replacement.

5. **Storm Water Pollution Control and Drainage Systems Maintenance.** Owner shall maintain the drainage system and storm water pollution control devices intended to intercept siltation and other potential pollutants (including, but not limited to, hydrocarbons, fecal bacteria, herbicides, fertilizers, etc.) in a functioning state (and in accordance with the Operations and Maintenance Procedure Plan approved by the Building Official). Should any of the project’s surface or subsurface drainage structures or storm water pollution control methods fail to capture, infiltrate, and/or treat, or result in increased erosion, the Owner shall be responsible for any necessary repairs to the system and restoration of the eroded area. Should repairs or restoration become necessary, prior to the commencement of such repair or restoration work, the applicant shall submit a repair and
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restoration plan to the Community Development Director to determine if an amendment or a new Building Permit is required to authorize such work. The Owner is responsible for the adequacy of any project-related drainage facilities and for the continued maintenance thereof in a manner that will preclude any hazard to life, health, or damage to the Real Property or any adjoining property.

6. **Required Private Covenants.** The Owners shall record in the official records of Santa Barbara County either private covenants, a reciprocal easement agreement, or a similar agreement which, among other things, shall provide for all of the following:

   a. **Common Area Maintenance.** An express method for the appropriate and regular maintenance of the common areas, common access ways, common utilities and other similar shared or common facilities or improvements of the development, which methodology shall also provide for an appropriate cost-sharing of such regular maintenance among the various owners of the condominium units.

   b. **Garages Available for Parking.** A covenant that includes a requirement that all garages be kept open and available for the parking of vehicles owned by the residents of the property in the manner for which the garages were designed and permitted.

   c. **Landscape Maintenance.** A covenant that provides that the landscaping shown on the approved Landscaping Plan shall be maintained and preserved at all times in accordance with the Plan.

   d. **Trash and Recycling.** Trash holding areas shall include recycling containers with at least equal capacity as the trash containers, and trash/recycling areas shall be easily accessed by the consumer and the trash hauler. Green waste shall either have containers adequate for the landscaping or be hauled off site by the landscaping maintenance company. If no green waste containers are provided for common interest developments, include an item in the CC&Rs stating that the green waste will be hauled off site.

   e. **Gates.** Any gates that have the potential to block access to any designated commercial space shall be locked in the open position during business hours.

   f. **Covenant Enforcement.** A covenant that permits each owner to contractually enforce the terms of the private covenants, reciprocal easement agreement, or similar agreement required by this condition.

7. **Tree Protection.** The existing tree(s) shown on the Tree Removal and Protection Plan shall be preserved, protected, and maintained (in accordance with the recommendations contained in the arborist’s report prepared by Peter Winn, dated August 17, 2007). A copy of this report shall be attached to the recorded
conditions as an exhibit. During construction, protection measures shall be provided, including but not limited to fencing of the area surrounding the trees.

B. **Public Works Submittal Prior to Final Map Approval.** The Owner shall submit the following, or evidence of completion of the following, to the Public Works Department for review and approval, prior to processing the approval of the Final Map and prior to the issuance of any permits for the project:

1. **Final Map.** The Owner shall submit to the Public Works Department for approval, a Final Map prepared by a licensed land surveyor or registered Civil Engineer. The Final Map shall conform to the requirements of the City Survey Control Ordinance.

2. **Dedication(s).** Easements as shown on the approved Tentative Subdivision Map and described as follows, subject to approval of the easement scope and location by the Public Works Department and/or the Building and Safety Division:
   
a. A reciprocal access easement (18 feet in width) for vehicles and pedestrians on subject property in favor of adjacent lot, APN 031-012-022.

3. **Water Rights Assignment Agreement.** The Owner shall assign to the City of Santa Barbara the exclusive right to extract ground water from under the Real Property in an *Agreement Assigning Water Extraction Rights.* Public Works Engineering Division staff will prepare said agreement for the Owner’s signature.

4. **Required Private Covenants.** The Owner shall submit a copy of the recorded private covenants, reciprocal easement agreement, or similar private agreements required for the project. If the private covenants required pursuant to Section A.6 above have not yet been approved by the Department of Real Estate, a draft of such covenants shall be submitted.

5. **Drainage Calculations.** The Owner shall submit drainage calculations prepared by a registered civil engineer or licensed architect demonstrating that the new development will not increase runoff amounts above existing conditions for a 25-year storm event. Any increase in runoff shall be retained on-site.

6. **Drainage and Water Quality.** Project drainage shall be designed, installed, and maintained such that stormwater runoff from the first inch of rain from any storm event shall be retained and treated onsite in accordance with the City’s NPDES Storm Water Management Permit. Runoff should be directed into a passive water treatment method such as a bioswale, landscape feature (planter beds and/or lawns), infiltration trench, etc. Project plans for grading, drainage, stormwater treatment methods, and project development, shall be subject to review and approval by City Building Division and Public Works Department. Sufficient engineered design and adequate measures shall be employed to ensure that no significant construction-related or long-term effects from increased runoff, erosion and sedimentation, urban water pollutants, or groundwater pollutants would result from the project. The Owner shall maintain the drainage system and storm water pollution control methods in a functioning state.
7. **Santa Barbara Street Public Improvements.** The Owner shall submit C-1 public improvement plans for construction of improvements along the property frontage on **Santa Barbara Street.** The C-1 plans shall be submitted separately from plans submitted for a Building Permit. As determined by the Public Works Department, the improvements shall include the following: realignment of curb and gutter and construction of new bulb-out with one-way directional ramp at intersection of Santa Barbara and De La Guerra Streets, (6') six-foot wide sidewalk, (4') four-foot wide parkway, slurry seal to the centerline of the street along entire subject property frontage and slurry seal a minimum of 20 feet beyond the limit of all trenching, connection to City water and sewer mains, private on-site sewer and water mains, public drainage improvements with supporting drainage calculations for installation of A470 curb drain outlets etc., coordinate with City staff to relocate existing street light standard to back of new curb alignment, final location to be determined by the Facilities Construction Superintendent, relocate existing fire hydrant and place proposed water meters to back of new curb, preserve and/or reset survey monuments and contractor stamps, supply and install directional/regulatory traffic control signs per the 2006 MUTCD w/CA supplements, and provide adequate positive drainage from site. Any work in the public right-of-way requires a Public Works Permit. C-1's shall be prepared by a licensed civil engineer, and require the review, approval and signature of the City Engineer.

8. **De la Guerra Street Public Improvements.** The Owner shall submit C-1 public improvement plans for construction of improvements along the property frontage on **De la Guerra Street.** The C-1 plans shall be submitted separately from plans submitted for a Building Permit. As determined by the Public Works Department, the improvements shall include the following: realignment of curb and gutter and construction of new bulb-out with one-way directional ramp at intersection of Santa Barbara and De la Guerra Streets, (6') six-foot wide sidewalk, (4') four-foot wide parkway, driveway apron modified to meet Title 24 requirements, slurry seal to the centerline of the street along entire subject property frontage and slurry seal a minimum of 20 feet beyond the limits of all trenching, underground service utilities, connection to City water and sewer mains, private on-site sewer and water mains, public drainage improvements with supporting drainage calculations for installation of drainage pipe, curb drain outlets, slot/trench drain, etc., preserve and/or reset survey monuments and contractor stamps, supply and install directional/regulatory traffic control signs per the 2006 MUTCD w/CA supplements, and provide adequate positive drainage from site. Any work in the public right-of-way requires a Public Works Permit. C-1's shall be prepared by a licensed civil engineer, and require the review, approval and signature of the City Engineer.

9. **Land Development Agreement.** The Owner shall submit an executed Agreement for Land Development Improvements, prepared by the Engineering Division, an
Engineer’s Estimate, signed, and stamped by a registered civil engineer, and securities for construction of improvements prior to execution of the agreement.

10. **Encroachment Permits.** Apply for an Encroachment Permit from the Public Works Department for the existing stone wall encroaching into the public right of way, and provide a report from a licensed civil engineer or structural engineer ascertaining the structural integrity of the decorative sandstone wall, with recommendations for repair.

11. **Miscellaneous Permits.** Owner shall obtain a Wastewater Discharge Permit from El Estero Wastewater Treatment Plant to discharge polluted water from the below grade Garage Area Drain to the City sewer main per CBC §311.2.2.

12. **Removal or Relocation of Public Facilities.** Removal or relocation of any public utilities or structures must be performed by the Owner or by the person or persons having ownership or control thereof.

C. **Design Review.** The following items are subject to the review and approval of the Historic Landmarks Commission (HLC). HLC shall not grant preliminary approval of the project until the following conditions have been satisfied.

1. **Tree Removal and Replacement.** All trees removed, except fruit trees and street trees approved for removal without replacement by the Parks Department, shall be replaced on-site on a one-for-one basis with minimum 24-inch box sized trees of an appropriate species or like species.

2. **Tree Protection Measures.** The landscape plan and grading plan shall include the following tree protection measures:
   a. **Landscaping Under Trees.** Landscaping under the tree(s) shall be compatible with the preservation of the tree(s).
   b. **Arborist's Report.** Include a note on the plans that recommendations/conditions contained in the arborist’s report prepared by Peter Winn, dated August 17, 2007, shall be implemented.

3. **Useable Common Open Space.** Adequate usable common open space shall be provided in a location accessible by all units within the development.

4. **Pedestrian Pathway.** A separate pedestrian pathway shall be provided to the units on the property from the sidewalk using a different paving/walkway material.

5. **Minimize Visual Effect of Paving.** Textured or colored pavement shall be used in paved areas of the project to minimize the visual effect of the expanse of paving, create a pedestrian environment, and provide access for all users.

6. **Screened Check Valve/Backflow.** The check valve or anti-backflow devices for fire sprinkler and/or irrigation systems shall be provided in a location screened from public view or included in the exterior wall of the building.
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7. **Permeable Paving.** Incorporate a permeable paving system for the project walkway(s) that will allow a portion of the paved area runoff to percolate into the ground, except as necessary to meet Fire Department weight requirements. Materials in driveways and parking areas must be approved by the Transportation Manager.

D. **Public Works Requirements Prior to Building Permit Issuance.** The Owner shall submit the following, or evidence of completion of the following to the Public Works Department for review and approval, prior to the issuance of a Building Permit for the project.

1. **Recordation of Agreements.** After City Council approval, the Owner shall provide evidence of recordation to the Public Works Department.
   a. Agreement Relating to Subdivision Conditions Imposed on Real Property;
   b. Land Development Agreement
   c. Agreement Assigning Water Extraction Rights.

2. **Approved Public Improvement Plans and Issuance of Public Works Permit.** Upon acceptance of the approved public improvement plans, a Public Works permit shall be issued with a Building permit.

E. **Community Development Requirements Prior to Building or Public Works Permit Application/Issuance.** The following shall be finalized prior to, and/or submitted with, the application for any Building or Public Works permit:

1. **Contractor and Subcontractor Notification.** The Owner shall notify in writing all contractors and subcontractors of the site rules, restrictions, and Conditions of Approval. Submit a copy of the notice to the Planning Division.

2. **Traffic Control Plan.** A traffic control plan shall be submitted, as specified in the City of Santa Barbara Traffic Control Guidelines. Traffic Control Plans are subject to approval by the Transportation Manager.

3. **Archaeological Monitoring Contract.** Submit to the Planning Division a contract with an archaeologist from the most current City Qualified Archaeologists List for monitoring during all ground-disturbing activities associated with the project, including, but not limited to, grading, excavation, trenching vegetation or paving removal and ground clearance in the areas identified in the Phase 1 Archaeological Resources Report prepared for this site by David Stone, dated November 2006. The contract shall be subject to the review and approval of the Planning Division.

The archaeologist’s monitoring contract shall include the following provisions: If cultural resources are encountered or suspected, work shall be halted or redirected by the archaeologist immediately and the Planning Division shall be notified. The archaeologist shall assess the nature, extent and significance of any discoveries and develop appropriate management recommendations for archaeological resource treatment, which may include, but are not limited to, redirection of grading and/or excavation activities, consultation and/or monitoring with a Barbareño Chumash...
representative from the most current City Qualified Barbareño Chumash Site Monitors List, preparation of further site studies and/or mitigation.

If the discovery consists of possible human remains, the Owner shall contact the Santa Barbara County Coroner immediately. If the Coroner determines that the remains are Native American, the Coroner shall contact the California Native American Heritage Commission. The Owner shall retain a Barbareño Chumash representative from the most current City Qualified Barbareño Chumash Site Monitors List shall be retained to monitor all further subsurface disturbance in the area of the find. Work in the area may only proceed after the Planning Division grants authorization.

If the discovery consists of possible prehistoric or Native American artifacts or materials, the Owner shall retain a Barbareño Chumash representative from the most current City Qualified Barbareño Chumash Site Monitors List shall be retained to monitor all further subsurface disturbance in the area of the find. Work in the area may only proceed after the Planning Division grants authorization.


5. **Park Commission Tree Removal Approval.** Submit to the Planning Division verification of approval from the Park Commission for the removal of any street tree.

6. **Arborist’s Monitoring.** Submit to the Planning Division an executed contract with a qualified arborist for monitoring during construction of all work adjacent to or above the critical root zone of existing trees to remain. The contract shall include a schedule for the arborist’s presence during grading and construction activities, and is subject to the review and approval of the Planning Division.

7. **Hazardous Materials Mitigation.** In accordance with the Santa Barbara County Fire Department, Fire Prevention Division, a soil vapor survey and human health risk assessment under FPD over site shall be performed, or an engineered control to mitigate potential vapor intrusion into any planned on-site building using a method acceptable to the FPD and consistent with the Interim Final Guidance for the Evaluation and Mitigation of Subsurface Vapor Intrusion to Indoor Air shall be developed prior to the issuance of any building permit.

8. **Prepare a Structural Crack Survey and Video Reconnaissance.** At least twenty (20) days prior to the issuance of a demolition permit, Owner shall notify owners and occupants of historic structures and buildings within 300 feet of the project site property lines of the opportunity to participate in a structural crack survey and video reconnaissance of their property. Prior to the issuance of a demolition permit, Owner shall prepare a structural crack survey and video reconnaissance of the property of those owners or occupants who express a desire to participate in the survey. The purpose of the survey shall be to document the existing condition of
neighboring historic structures 300 feet of the project site property line and more than 50 years old. After each major phase of project development (demolition, grading, and construction), a follow-up structural crack survey and video reconnaissance of the property of those owners and occupants who have elected to participate in the survey. Prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy, Owner shall meet with the owners and occupants who have elected to participate in the survey to determine whether any structural damage has occurred due to demolition, grading or construction at the project site. Owner shall be responsible for the cost of repairing any structural damage caused by project demolition, grading, or construction on properties that have elected to participate in the survey.

9. **Letter of Commitment for Pre-Construction Conference.** The Owner shall submit to the Planning Division a letter of commitment that states that, prior to disturbing any part of the project site for any reason and after the Building permit has been issued, the General Contractor shall schedule a conference to review site conditions, construction schedule, construction conditions, and environmental monitoring requirements. The conference shall include representatives from the Public Works Department Engineering and Transportation Divisions, the assigned Building Inspector, the Planning Division, the Property Owner, the Archaeologist, the Architect, the Arborist, the Landscape Architect, the Biologist, the Geologist, the Project Engineer, the Project Environmental Coordinator, the Contractor and each subcontractor.

F. **Building Permit Plan Requirements.** The following requirements/notes shall be incorporated into the construction plans submitted to the Building and Safety Division for Building permits.

1. **Design Review Requirements.** Plans shall show all design, landscape and tree protection elements, as approved by the Historic Landmarks Commission, outlined in Section C above.

2. **Pre-Construction Conference.** Not less than 10 days or more than 20 days prior to commencement of construction, a conference to review site conditions, construction schedule, construction conditions, and environmental monitoring requirements, shall be held by the General Contractor. The conference shall include representatives from the Public Works Department Engineering and Transportation Divisions, Building Division, Planning Division, the Property Owner Archaeologist, Architect, Arborist, Landscape Architect, Engineer, Project Environmental Coordinator, Mitigation Monitors, Contractor and each Subcontractor.

3. **Grading Plan Requirement for Archaeological Resources.** The following information shall be printed on the grading plans:

If archaeological resources are encountered or suspected, work shall be halted or redirected immediately and the Planning Division shall be notified. The archaeologist shall assess the nature, extent, and significance of any discoveries and

Updated on 5/14/2008
develop appropriate management recommendations for archaeological resource treatment, which may include, but are not limited to, redirection of grading and/or excavation activities, consultation and/or monitoring with a Barbareño Chumash representative from the most current City Qualified Barbareño Chumash Site Monitors List, etc.

If the discovery consists of possible human remains, the Santa Barbara County Coroner shall be contacted immediately. If the Coroner determines that the remains are Native American, the Coroner shall contact the California Native American Heritage Commission. A Barbareño Chumash representative from the most current City Qualified Barbareño Chumash Site Monitors List shall be retained to monitor all further subsurface disturbance in the area of the find. Work in the area may only proceed after the Planning Division grants authorization.

If the discovery consists of possible prehistoric or Native American artifacts or materials, a Barbareño Chumash representative from the most current City Qualified Barbareño Chumash Site Monitors List shall be retained to monitor all further subsurface disturbance in the area of the find. Work in the area may only proceed after the Planning Division grants authorization.

4. **Post-Construction Erosion Control and Water Quality Plan.** Provide an engineered drainage plan that addresses the existing drainage patterns and leads towards improvement of the quality and rate of water run-off conditions from the site by capturing, infiltrating, and/or treating drainage and preventing erosion. The Owner shall passive water quality methods, such as bioswales, catch basins, or storm drain on the Real Property, or other measures specified in the Erosion Control Plan, to intercept all sediment and other potential pollutants (including, but not limited to, hydrocarbons, fecal bacteria, herbicides, fertilizers, etc.) from the parking lot areas and other improved, hard-surfaced areas prior to discharge into the public storm drain system, including any creeks. All proposed methods shall be reviewed and approved by the Public Works Department and the Building and Safety Division. Maintenance of these facilities shall be provided by the Owner, as outlined in Condition B.6 above, which shall include the regular sweeping and/or vacuuming of parking areas and drainage and storm water methods maintenance program.

5. **Trash Enclosure Provision.** A trash enclosure with adequate area for recycling containers (an area that allows for a minimum of 50 percent of the total capacity for recycling containers) shall be provided on the Real Property and screened from view from surrounding properties and the street.

6. **Trash Dumpsters.** Dumpsters and containers with a capacity of 1.5 cubic yards or more shall not be placed within five (5) feet of combustible walls, openings, or roofs, unless protected with fire sprinklers.

7. **Commercial Dumpsters.** Commercial dumpsters shall be provided, including, at a minimum, an equal area for recycling containers. Dumpsters shall not be placed
within five feet (5') of combustible walls, openings, or combustible roof eaves lines unless sprinkler coverage is provided.

8. **Project Directory.** A project directory, including map and parking directional signs listing all units on-site shall be indicated on the project plans. This directory shall be lit sufficiently for readability for site visitors and placed in a location or locations acceptable to the Fire Department, shall meet current accessibility requirements, and is subject to Sign Committee Approval.

9. **Utilities.** Provide individual water, electricity, and gas meters, and sewer lateral for each residential unit. Service lines for each unit shall be separate until a point five feet (5') outside the building.

10. **Conditions on Plans/Signatures.** The final Planning Commission Resolution shall be provided on a full size drawing sheet as part of the drawing sets. Each condition shall have a sheet and/or note reference to verify condition compliance. If the condition relates to a document submittal, indicate the status of the submittal (e.g., Final Map submitted to Public Works Department for review). A statement shall also be placed on the above sheet as follows: The undersigned have read and understand the above conditions, and agree to abide by any and all conditions which is their usual and customary responsibility to perform, and which are within their authority to perform.

Signed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Owner</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G. **Construction Implementation Requirements.** All of these construction requirements shall be carried out in the field by the Owner and/or Contractor for the duration of the project construction. (Community Development Department staff shall review the plans and specifications to assure that they are incorporated into the bid documents, such that potential contractors will be aware of the following requirements prior to submitting a bid for the contract.)

1. **Demolition/Construction Materials Recycling.** Recycling and/or reuse of demolition/construction materials shall be carried out to the extent feasible, and containers shall be provided on site for that purpose, in order to minimize construction-generated waste conveyed to the landfill. Indicate on the plans the location of a container of sufficient size to handle the materials, subject to review and approval by the City Solid Waste Specialist, for collection of
demolition/construction materials. A minimum of 90% of demolition and construction materials shall be recycled or reused. Evidence shall be submitted at each inspection to show that recycling and/or reuse goals are being met.

2. **Sandstone Curb Recycling.** Any existing sandstone curb in the public right-of-way that is removed and not reused shall be salvaged and sent to the City Corporation Annex Yard.

3. **Construction-Related Truck Trips.** Construction-related truck trips shall not be scheduled during peak hours (7:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.). The purpose of this condition is to help reduce truck traffic on adjacent streets and roadways.

4. **Construction Related Traffic Routes.** The route of construction-related traffic shall be established to minimize trips through surrounding residential neighborhoods, subject to approval by the Public Works Director.

5. **Haul Routes.** The haul route(s) for all construction-related trucks, three tons or more, entering or exiting the site, shall be approved by the Public Works Director.

6. **Traffic Control Plan.** All elements of the approved Traffic Control Plan shall be carried out by the Contractor.

7. **Construction Hours.** Construction (including preparation for construction work) is prohibited Monday through Friday before 7:00 a.m. and after 5:00 p.m., and all day on Saturdays, Sundays and holidays observed by the City of Santa Barbara, as shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Holiday</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Year’s Day</td>
<td>January 1st*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Luther King’s Birthday</td>
<td>3rd Monday in January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidents’ Day</td>
<td>3rd Monday in February</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorial Day</td>
<td>Last Monday in May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence Day</td>
<td>July 4th*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Day</td>
<td>1st Monday in September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thanksgiving Day</td>
<td>4th Thursday in November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Following Thanksgiving Day</td>
<td>Friday following Thanksgiving Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christmas Day</td>
<td>December 25th*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*When a holiday falls on a Saturday or Sunday, the preceding Friday or following Monday, respectively, shall be observed as a legal holiday.

When, based on required construction type or other appropriate reasons, it is necessary to do work outside the allowed construction hours, contractor shall contact the Chief of Building and Safety to request a waiver from the above construction hours, using the procedure outlined in Santa Barbara Municipal Code §9.16.015 Construction Work at Night. Contractor shall notify all residents within 300 feet of the parcel of intent to carry out night construction a minimum of 48 hours prior to said construction. Said notification shall include what the work
includes, the reason for the work, the duration of the proposed work and a contact number.

8. **Construction Parking/Storage/Staging.** Construction parking and storage shall be provided as follows:
   
a. During construction, free parking spaces for construction workers and construction shall be provided on-site or off-site in a location subject to the approval of the Public Works Director. Construction workers are prohibited from parking within the public right-of-way, except as outlined in subparagraph b. below.
   
b. Parking in the public right of way is permitted as posted by Municipal Code, as reasonably allowed for in the 2006 Greenbook (or latest reference), and with a Public Works permit in restricted parking zones. No more than three (3) individual parking permits *without extensions* may be issued for the life of the project.
   
c. Storage or staging of construction materials and equipment within the public right-of-way shall not be permitted, unless approved by the Transportation Manager.

9. **Water Sprinkling During Grading.** During site grading and transportation of fill materials, regular water sprinkling shall occur on-site, using reclaimed water whenever the Public Works Director determines that it is reasonably available. During clearing, grading, earth moving or excavation, sufficient quantities of water, through use of either water trucks or sprinkler systems, shall be applied on-site to prevent dust from leaving the site. Each day, after construction activities cease, the entire area of disturbed soil shall be sufficiently moistened to create a crust.
   
Throughout construction, water trucks or sprinkler systems shall also be used to keep all areas of vehicle movement on-site damp enough to prevent dust raised from leaving the site. At a minimum, this will include wetting down such areas in the late morning and after work is completed for the day. Increased watering frequency will be required whenever the wind speed exceeds 15 mph.

10. **Expeditious Paving.** All roadways, driveways, sidewalks, etc., shall be paved as soon as possible. Additionally, building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used, as directed by the Building Inspector.

11. **Gravel Pads.** Gravel pads shall be installed at all access points to the project site to prevent tracking of mud on to public roads.

12. **Street Sweeping.** The property frontage and adjacent property frontages, and parking and staging areas at the construction site shall be swept daily to decrease sediment transport to the public storm drain system and dust.
13. **Construction Best Management Practices (BMPs).** Construction activities shall address water quality through the use of BMPs, as approved by the Building and Safety Division.

14. **Parking Loss Requirements.** At least two (2) weeks prior to closure of the parking lot on the Real Property, the Owner shall notify all lot users, in writing, of the closure, and shall inform them of the availability of spaces in the City's commuter parking lots, and offer to pay the commuter parking lot permit cost. A copy of such notification shall be sent to the Community Development Director and Transportation Manager.

The commuter parking permits may be temporarily or permanently reduced in number or increased back to 22 permits by the City Transportation Division, if necessary, by submitting a letter to the Owner of the Real Property, which states that only a specific number of permits are available, based on the availability of parking in the commuter lots. The City is not obligated to provide permits.

15. **Tree Protection.** All trees not indicated for removal on the site plan shall be preserved, protected, and maintained, in accordance with the Tree Protection Plan, if required, and any related Conditions of Approval.

16. **Tree Protection.** Notes on the grading plan that specify the following:
   a. No grading shall occur within three feet of the driplines of the existing tree(s).
   b. A qualified Arborist shall be present during any excavation adjacent to or beneath the dripline of the trees which are required to be protected.
   c. All excavation within the dripline of the trees shall be done with hand tools.
   d. Any roots encountered shall be cleanly cut.
   e. No heavy equipment, storage of materials or parking shall take place under the dripline of the trees.
   f. Any root pruning and trimming shall be done under the direction of a qualified Arborist.
   g. All trees within 25 feet of proposed construction activity shall be fenced three feet outside the dripline for protection.

17. **Tree Relocation.** The existing Mexican Fan Palm trees shall be relocated on the Real Property and shall be fenced and protected during construction.

18. **Construction Equipment Maintenance.** All construction equipment, including trucks, shall be professionally maintained and fitted with standard manufacturers’ muffler and silencing devices.

19. **Noise Control Blankets/Curtains.** Noise control blankets shall be used as noise barriers for equipment noise enclosures, if required, and as noise barriers along the property line between Anacapa School and the project site in order to reduce
construction noise to less than 60 dBA. The noise blanket/curtain shall have a minimum Sound Transmission Class (STC) rating of 25.

20. **Graffiti Abatement Required.** Owner and Contractor shall be responsible for removal of all graffiti as quickly as possible. Graffiti not removed within 24 hours of notice by the Building and Safety Division may result in a Stop Work order being issued, or may be removed by the City, at the Owner's expense, as provided in SBMC Chapter 9.66.

21. **Unanticipated Archaeological Resources Contractor Notification.** Prior to the start of any vegetation or paving removal, demolition, trenching or grading, contractors and construction personnel shall be alerted to the possibility of uncovering unanticipated subsurface archaeological features or artifacts associated with past human occupation of the parcel. If such archaeological resources are encountered or suspected, work shall be halted immediately, the City Environmental Analyst shall be notified and the applicant shall retain an archaeologist from the most current City Qualified Archaeologists List. The latter shall be employed to assess the nature, extent and significance of any discoveries and to develop appropriate management recommendations for archaeological resource treatment, which may include, but are not limited to, redirection of grading and/or excavation activities, consultation and/or monitoring with a Barbareño Chumash representative from the most current City qualified Barbareño Chumash Site Monitors List, etc.

If the discovery consists of possible human remains, the Santa Barbara County Coroner shall be contacted immediately. If the Coroner determines that the remains are Native American, the Coroner shall contact the California Native American Heritage Commission. A Barbareño Chumash representative from the most current City Qualified Barbareño Chumash Site Monitors List shall be retained to monitor all further subsurface disturbance in the area of the find. Work in the area may only proceed after the Environmental Analyst grants authorization.

If the discovery consists of possible prehistoric or Native American artifacts or materials, a Barbareño Chumash representative from the most current City Qualified Barbareño Chumash Site Monitors List shall be retained to monitor all further subsurface disturbance in the area of the find. Work in the area may only proceed after the Environmental Analyst grants authorization.

H. **Prior to Certificate of Occupancy.** Prior to issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy, the Owner of the Real Property shall complete the following:

1. **Repair Damaged Public Improvements.** Repair any damaged public improvements (curbs, gutters, sidewalks, roadways, etc.) caused by construction, subject to the review and approval of the Public Works Department per SBMC §22.60.090. Where tree roots are the cause of the damage, the roots shall be pruned under the direction of the City Arborist.
2. **Complete Public Improvements.** Public improvements, as shown in the separate C-1 public improvement plans, including utility service undergrounding and installation of street trees.

3. **Record Drawings.** Submit Record Drawings identifying “as-built” conditions of public improvements to the Public Works Inspector for verification and approval, if original C-1 public improvement plans are edited to reflect proposed improvements, and stamp corrected original mylars as “Record Drawings”.

4. **Fire Hydrant Replacement.** Replace existing nonconforming type fire hydrant(s) with commercial-type hydrant(s) described in Standard Detail 6-003.1 Paragraph 2 of the Public Works Department Standard Details.

5. **Manholes.** Raise all sewer and water manholes on easement to final finished grade if necessitated by project improvements.

6. **Noise Measurements.** Submit a final report from a licensed acoustical engineer, verifying that interior and exterior living area noise levels are within acceptable levels as specified in the Noise Element. In the event the noise is not mitigated to acceptable levels, additional mitigation measures shall be recommended by the noise specialist and implemented subject to the review and approval of the Building and Safety Division and the Historic Landmarks Commission (HLC).

7. **Existing Street Trees.** Submit a letter from a qualified arborist, verifying that the existing street tree(s) have been properly pruned and trimmed.

8. **Archaeological Monitoring Report.** A final report on the results of the archaeological monitoring shall be submitted to the Planning Division within 180 days of completion of the monitoring or prior to the issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy, whichever is earlier.

9. **New Construction Photographs.** Photographs of the new construction, taken from the same locations as those taken of the story poles prior to project approval, shall be taken, attached to 8 ½ x 11” board and submitted to the Planning Division.

10. **Evidence of Private CC&Rs Recordation.** Evidence shall be provided that the private CC&Rs required in Section A have been recorded.

**I. Litigation Indemnification Agreement.** In the event the Planning Commission approval of the Project is appealed to the City Council, Applicant/Owner hereby agrees to defend the City, its officers, employees, agents, consultants and independent contractors ("City’s Agents") from any third party legal challenge to the City Council’s denial of the appeal and approval of the Project, including, but not limited to, challenges filed pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (collectively “Claims”). Applicant/Owner further agrees to indemnify and hold harmless the City and the City’s Agents from any award of attorney fees or court costs made in connection with any Claim.

Applicant/Owner shall execute a written agreement, in a form approved by the City Attorney, evidencing the foregoing commitments of defense and indemnification within thirty (30) days of the City Council denial of the appeal and approval of the Project. These
commitments of defense and indemnification are material conditions of the approval of the Project. If Applicant/Owner fails to execute the required defense and indemnification agreement within the time allotted, the Project approval shall become null and void absent subsequent acceptance of the agreement by the City, which acceptance shall be within the City’s sole and absolute discretion. Nothing contained in this condition shall prevent the City or the City’s Agents from independently defending any Claim. If the City or the City’s Agents decide to independently defend a Claim, the City and the City’s Agents shall bear their own attorney fees, expenses, and costs of that independent defense.

NOTICE OF TENTATIVE SUBDIVISION MAP (INCLUDING NEW CONDOMINIUMS AND CONDOMINIUM CONVERSIONS) TIME LIMITS:

The Planning Commission's action approving the Tentative Map shall expire two (2) years from the date of approval. The subdivider may request an extension of this time period in accordance with Santa Barbara Municipal Code §27.07.110.
Honorables Planning Commissioners
City of Santa Barbara
630 Garden Street
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

RE: 800 Santa Barbara Street (MST2006-00129)
Tentative Map- Six Residential Condominiums and Ten Commercial Condominium Units

Dear Planning Commissioners,

On behalf of 800 Santa Barbara Street LLC, property owner of 800 Santa Barbara Street, we are pleased to submit this project description/applicant letter for your review and consideration of the proposed mixed-use development located at the corner of De La Guerra and Santa Barbara Streets in the Central Business District.

Project Description

Existing Condition
The subject property contains an existing 2,111 square foot, single story office building located at 800 Santa Barbara St., APN 031-012-028, at the corner of De La Guerra and Santa Barbara Streets in the El Pueblo Viejo district of Santa Barbara. The site is zoned C-2 and the lot size is 18,586 square feet. The lot is virtually flat with an approximate slope of 4%. There are currently 22 parking spaces on site. There is an existing lease agreement that entitles 223 E. De La Guerra to utilize 13 of the 22 spaces located on 800 Santa Barbara Street.

Proposed Project
The project includes the demolition of the existing office building and the construction of a 14,747 square foot, 2 and 3-story mixed-use project. We are requesting Planning Commission approval of a Development Plan for 2,873 new commercial square feet (net) and a Tentative Subdivision Map to create six residential condominiums and ten commercial condominiums. There are twenty-seven parking spaces proposed in an underground parking structure. To protect historic resources and in the interest of sensitive site design, the sandstone wall along the perimeter of the site will be preserved as well as an existing flagpole at the east end of the walkway. The existing brick pathway will also be re-used in the proposed project preserving public pedestrian access through the site.

Please refer to Sheet A-000 for the project statistics summary.

800 SANTA BARBARA
TEL 805 966-275

EXHIBIT C
The six residential units are a mix of 2-and 3-bedroom units and range in size from 1,316 square feet to 2,249 square feet. The ten proposed commercial units are approximately 400 square feet each and could ultimately be combined to provide varying unit sizes.

The residential and commercial units are configured around a central courtyard in two main buildings; however, the units are connected structurally by the underlying garage. The commercial condominium units are located along the northern side of the property, adjacent to Anacapa School; a small portion of the commercial building will have frontage along Santa Barbara Street. There are five commercial units on the ground level and five proposed on the second story. The residential units are located along the southern and eastern sides of the site. The residential condominium Units 2, 3, 4 and 5 have street frontage along Santa Barbara and De la Guerra Streets and Units 1 and 6 are located in the northeast corner of the site.

The majority of the building is two stories, however, there is a three story element at the northeast corner of the property, furthest from the public streets. The maximum height of the proposed building is 37’, well below the commercial zones’ maximum building height of 60’ per SBMC §28.66.050. We have provided visual simulations to show the proposed structure in relation to the existing setting. Similar to the proposed development, there are other two and three story commercial buildings within the block, including the adjacent building located at 223 E. De La Guerra and Antioch University on the corner of Garden and De La Guerra Street.

The applicant proposes to underground the parking spaces in the existing surface lot that is accessed from De La Guerra Street. The underground parking structure will require 3,830 cubic yards of excavation under the existing building footprint and this will be exported off-site.

The parking proposed is provided in accordance with SBMC§28.90.100.H.b of the City’s Zoning Ordinance which requires one parking space per residential unit in the Central Business District and does not require guest parking. The project provides six private garages for each of the residential units. The commercial component of the project requires ten spaces at one space per 500 square feet. Eleven parking spaces are provided pursuant to an existing lease agreement with the adjacent property owner. In summary, there are a total of 28 spaces provided in the underground parking garage to accommodate the proposed project and the existing obligation to the adjacent property.

Every effort has been made to preserve the site’s most significant landscape on the southwest corner of the site at the intersection of Santa Barbara and De La Guerra Street. Overall, the total landscaping will cover approximately 21.8% percent of the site. The private outdoor living space proposed for all of the residential units significantly exceeds the minimum requirement, particularly for Units 2, 3 and 6 where the private outdoor living space is 3-5 times the minimum requirement (refer to building statistics on Sheet A-000). The common open space is also significantly larger than the minimum requirement and provides over 5 times the minimum square footage required.
We have proposed a curb extension to improve sight visibility and pedestrian safety at the intersection of Santa Barbara and De La Guerra Streets, shown on the civil plans. The “bulb-out” design will shorten the pedestrian crossing on Santa Barbara Street and it will require vehicular traffic to make more of a 90 degree turn from De La Guerra Street to Santa Barbara Street. The revised angle of the intersection will result in improved sight visibility at the crosswalk on Santa Barbara Street. The modified right-of-way along Santa Barbara and De La Guerra Streets will be landscaped with trees and decomposed granite, consistent with the existing streetscape in front of and adjacent to the project site.

There is a total of 4,838 commercial square feet proposed in this project. We are requesting to use 2,873 square feet out of the minor and small additions categories in accordance with the SBMC §28.87.300.B.14. The remaining 1,965 square feet will be allocated from the demolition of the existing commercial office space on site.

**Historic Landmarks Commission Review**

The project has been reviewed by Historic Landmarks Commission (HLC) on several occasions, including review and approval of the Phase I Archaeological and Historic reports. The current design has received favorable comments as reflected in the minutes of their meeting on January 10, 2007 after a redesign of the northern buildings on the properties.

On October 4, 2006 the Historic Structures and Site report prepared by Alexandra Cole was reviewed and approved by the HLC with the condition that the second sentence of the second paragraph on page 16 should be changed to read “its presence as a larger-scale buildings may impact these historic buildings.” The design was also reviewed at this meeting for the initial concept review and public hearing. Anacapa School expressed concern at this meeting regarding the residential units along the northern property line adversely affecting the School because the balconies would be overlooking the school yard. The comments from the HLC pertaining to the adjacent properties focused on reducing the mass, bulk and scale to provide a buffer. The project team took the Anacapa School’s comments and the HLC’s direction into consideration and significantly redesigned the site plan.

On November 15, 2006 the project returned to HLC for the second concept review. The Commission appreciated the redesign which incorporated small commercial units (instead of the previously proposed residential units) along the northern property line, adjacent to Anacapa School in order to avoid potential conflict between residential balconies and the adjacent school yard activities. The Commission also expressed appreciation that the project proposed to maintain the existing brick walkway and the axial layout of the site plan.

On January 10, 2007, the project was given positive comments and continued indefinitely to the Planning Commission. The Commission stated in the motion, “The Commission likes the project as a whole, in particular: a) how it addressed the corner; b) the landscape screen provided from the corner; c) how the project ahhs been pulled back from Anacapa School, providing a landscape buffer; d) and the change of use from residential to commercial facing the school.”
An addendum to the original Historic Report was prepared by Alexandra Cole to address the site plan revisions in accordance with HLC comments and was subsequently reviewed and approved at HLC on March 21, 2007.

**Neighborhood Coordination**
During the HLC design review process, the project team coordinated with Anacapa School in order to address their concerns about the site design and construction related impacts (for additional discussion regarding noise, refer to section below entitled, *Acoustical Analysis*). The design to place the commercial units along the northern property addressed the school’s concern about the site design and potential impacts from the adjacent residential uses. In addition, we are willing to include a disclosure about the existing school noise in the CC&R’s.

**Environmental Reports**

**Visual Resources**
In response to staff comments regarding preservation of important public view corridors in the project vicinity, photo simulations have been provided which demonstrate that these corridors will be maintained following project approval. The proposed structure is predominately two-story, with exception of a third story element located in the northeast corner of the property. The project was found to be in keeping with the character of the neighborhood as evidenced by the positive comments received from the Historic Landmarks Commission. Further, the project provides notable setbacks on both Santa Barbara and De la Guerra Streets along with substantial vegetation that is proposed to maintain the openness that currently exists on the corner.

**Archaeological**
The Phase I Archaeological Resources Report prepared by David Stone was accepted and approved by the HLC on February 7, 2007 with the condition that monitoring during grading activities shall be required. The condition has been incorporated into the recommended conditions of approval attached to the staff report.

**Landscaping/Arborist Report**
There are several existing non-native mature trees on site; these trees include a variety of Olive, Palms, Black Acacia, Mexican Fan Palms and Pepper trees. Peter Winn with Westree prepared an arborist report, dated July 2006 to assess the condition of the existing trees and the potential impacts of construction. He noted that the Blackwood Acacias are poorly structured and should be treated with caution. An updated report dated March 5, 2007 was prepared to address site design changes, including tree protection recommendations. The report concluded that the proposed trees to remain in place are young and in healthy condition so they should fair well during construction. A subsequent report dated August 17, 2007 further addressed staff concerns related to protection of trees on the adjacent property to the north as well as the relocation of project site trees. The arborist’s recommendations on how to protect the trees to remain, including the City parkway trees, have been incorporated onto the landscape plans. Please
reference the Tree Removal and Protection Plan prepared by Peter Winn and Van Atta Associates, Inc. (sheet L1.0) to review the specific recommendations.

**Acoustical Analysis**
An Acoustical analysis was prepared by Veneklasen Associates to address potential noise impacts. The report concluded that the interior and exterior noise levels will be below the City threshold requirements contained in the General Plan Noise Element.

In order to minimize construction noise related impacts while Anacapa School is in session, the project description includes provisions to install noise control blankets with a minimum Sound Transmission Class (STC) rating of 25. The noise barrier is expected to reduce noise levels below 60 dBA, an acceptable ambient noise level. Further, compressors and other noise generating equipment including worker radios and sound equipment shall be kept away from the area of common property line with the school.

**Trip Generation and Intersection Analysis**
In response to staff concerns relative to a potential project impact to local intersections, a traffic analysis was prepared by Associated Transportation Engineers (ATE), dated September 12, 2007. The analysis determined when project generated vehicular trips were distributed to the area intersections they would continue to operate at acceptable Levels of Service (LOS A and B).

**Hazardous Materials**
In response to County of Santa Barbara Fire Department review of the proposed project and the possibility of potential site contamination with chlorinated solvents, the project description includes provisions for either of the following:

- Prior to site development, implementation of a soil vapor survey and human health risk assessment under the oversight of the County Fire Department; or
- An engineered control will be developed to prevent potential vapor intrusion into the structure using a method acceptable to County Fire and consistent with the Interim Final Guidance for the Evaluation and Mitigation of Subsurface Vapor Intrusion to Indoor Air.

**Zoning Ordinance and General Plan Consistency**
The subject property is zoned C-2, Commercial. This zone allows a variety of commercial uses in addition to residential uses. The proposed mixed-use development is consistent with the C-2 zone uses and development standards. The project application does not include zoning modification requests. Further, the proposed building footprint and overall height of the structure are not maximized and do not extend to the development limits allowed by code. For example, the proposed building at its highest point is 37.5 feet when 60 feet is allowed and the majority of the structure is setback from the property line (ranging from 13-27 feet) although no yard setbacks apply in a mixed-use development.

**Land Use Element**
The project site is located in the Laguna neighborhood as described in the City’s General Plan Land Use Element, on the border between the Downtown and Laguna neighborhoods. The
Laguna neighborhood is characterized by both single and multiple residential units, and on the west side as it merges with into downtown, mixed residential and commercial uses appear.

Because the property borders the Downtown neighborhood and is also located in the Central Business District (CBD), a brief discussion of these associated land use policies is warranted. One of the recommendations contained in the Land Use Element states that Downtown should be developed with a variety of businesses and services and that the importance of the area as a major office-administrative-financial-governmental activity should be recognized. Further, the Plan states the following, “It is critical that future growth in the CBD emphasize the further concentration, intensification, and more efficient use of the present core rather than by following the usual pattern of outward growth, increasing the amount of land and decreasing the efficiency and effectiveness of the uses within the area.” The proposed project fulfills the stated goal of concentrating development at the core with the inherent result of limiting urban sprawl.

The subject property is also located in a neighborhood that is characterized by a multitude of historic structures – the Presidio, the De la Guerra Adobe, the historical museum. The El Pueblo Viejo Ordinance establishes architectural criteria to assure that new buildings and developments in the area will be architecturally harmonious with the old. The General Plan indicates that an additional way the City can strengthen its commercial, cultural, and governmental core is to encourage residential uses to be located downtown above the stores, shops, and offices in the CBD. Such a mix of commercial, governmental office, and residential activity would enhance and enliven Santa Barbara’s downtown and would provide an interesting environment in which some people would like to live.

The proposed project is consistent with the goals and policies contained in the Land Use Element relative to development in the Downtown, the CBD, and in the Laguna neighborhood outlined above. The project provides additional commercial and residential use opportunities in a location deemed as the most efficient and effective use of land, concentrating development in the Downtown core where infrastructure and services are in place. Additionally, the Historic Landmarks Commission has reviewed the project and determined that the architectural design and building massing were in compliance with the standards established by ordinance and sensitive to the historic character of the surrounding neighborhood.

**Housing Element**

The proposed project can also be found consistent with the goals and policies contained in the City’s Housing Element. The proposed residential units provide a mix of bedroom and size configurations to meet varying household needs. Policy 4.3 of the Housing Element states that the City shall focus development on infill sites and give priority to mixed-use development. The project will result in an infill development and redevelopment opportunity by replacing the existing commercial and parking uses efficiently due in part to the proposed underground parking configuration. The mixed-use component of the proposed project is desirable due to the proximity to the Downtown and the possibility of working and living within the same structure or in the immediate project area.
Circulation Element

The project includes many components that resonate with the goals and policies of the City’s Circulation Element. For example, the intersection improvements proposed at the corner of Santa Barbara and De la Guerra Streets will create a much improved pedestrian experience with a wider parkway to buffer from vehicles, canopy trees to provide shade, reduction of vehicular speeds, and most importantly a safer pedestrian environment. Other project components that carry out Circulation Element goals include the retention of the brick walkway through the project site providing continued access from adjacent land uses and public rights-of-way.

The Circulation Element calls for land use decisions to encourage development that locate residential uses near areas of employment and services, to continue to implement zoning practices that encourage mixed use developments to improve pedestrian access and reduce automobile dependency. The project also affirms the Circulation Element Design Standards by placing the parking garage underground, by creating attractive and pleasing building facades that are oriented toward paseos, streets and sidewalks in place of a surface parking lot.

Discretionary Application Findings

Tentative Subdivision Map

The proposed project is consistent with the Zoning Ordinance and applicable General Plan policies as discussed above. The site is physically suitable for the proposed development, has received positive architectural and neighborhood compatibility comments from the Historic Landmarks Commission, and is consistent with the variable density provisions of the Municipal Code and the General Plan without resulting in environmental impacts.

New Condominium Development

The proposed project is in compliance with the provisions of the City’s Condominium Ordinance, meets density requirements, and meets the physical standards for new condominium development. The project can be found consistent with General Plan policies including the Land Use, Housing, and Circulation Elements. The project provides residential units in an area where residential development is a permitted use, is adequately served by public streets and on-site parking. The design has been reviewed by the Historic Landmarks Commission, which found the architecture and site design appropriate to the neighborhood.

Development Plan

As previously stated, the project complies with all provisions of the Zoning Ordinance, will be in keeping with the neighborhood aesthetics relative to size, bulk, scale, and architectural design. The development can be adequately served by water resources and will not have a significant adverse impact on traffic.

Project Justification

The project has gone through several revisions pursuant to staff comments and as part of the design review process resulting in a proposal that is sensitive and compatible with the surrounding neighborhood’s historic character. Visual simulations have been prepared to
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demonstrate that the structure will be an enhancement to the area and that scenic resources have been protected.

The project can be found to be consistent with the intent and purposes of applicable General Plan policies and the standards established in the Zoning Ordinance. As evidenced by the discussions and conclusions contained in the technical studies provided, the project will not result in a significant effect on the environment.

On behalf of the applicant project team, we thank you for your consideration of this project.

Sincerely,
SUZANNE ELLEDGE
PLANNING & PERMITTING SERVICES

[Signature]

Trish Allen, AICP
Associate Planner
HISTORIC LANDMARKS COMMISSION
MINUTES

Wednesday, October 4, 2006
David Gebhard Public Meeting Room: 630 Garden Street
1:30 P.M.

COMMISSION MEMBERS:

PHILIP SUDING, Chair – Present, left from 3:41 P.M. to
3:52 P.M.

WILLIAM LA VOIE, Vice-Chair – Present
LOUISE BOUCHER – Present
STEVE HAUSZ – Present at 1:35 P.M.
VADIM HSU – Present at 1:42 P.M.
ALEX PUJO – Present at 1:33 P.M.
CAREN RAGER – Absent
FERMINA MURRAY – Present, left at 3:49 P.M.
SUSETTE NAYLOR – Present
ADVISORY MEMBER:
DR. MICHAEL GLASSOW – Absent
CITY COUNCIL LIAISON:
ROGER HORTON – Absent
PLANNING COMMISSION LIAISON:
WILLIAM MAHAN – Absent
STAFF:
PAUL CASEY, Community Development Director – Present from 1:55 P.M. to 2:42
P.M.
BETTIE WEISS, City Planner – Present from 2:52 P.M. to 3:16 P.M.
JAIME LIMÓN, Design Review Supervisor – Present from 1:38 P.M. to 3:16 P.M.
JAKE JACOBUS, Urban Historian – Present until 5:43 P.M.
SUSAN GANTZ, Planning Technician II – Present
GABRIELA FELICIANO, Commission Secretary – Present

800 SANTA BARBARA ST
C-2 Zone
(3:25) Assessor's Parcel Number: 031-012-028
Application Number: MST2006-00129
Owner: 800 Santa Barbara Street Investment Company
Applicant: Suzanne Elledge Planning and Permitting

(Proposal to demolish an existing 1,965 square foot office building and construct
a three-story mixed-use project comprised of eight residential and two
commercial condominium units on an 18,713 square foot parcel. Thirty
underground parking spaces would be provided. Planning Commission approval
will be required for a lot line adjustment of 1,529 square feet from adjacent parcel
number 031-012-027 to meet residential density requirements.)

(PROJECT REQUIRES ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND
PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVAL.)

Present: Mike Foley, Owner
Brian Cearnal, Architect
Susan McLaughlin, SEPPS
Susan Van Atta, Landscape Architect

Public comment opened at 3:37 p.m.

EXHIBIT D
Mr. Eric Lassen, President of Anacapa School Board of Trustees, expressed concern that the proposed project does not consider the impact to the Anacapa School yard and that the setbacks are extraordinarily small with balconies overlooking the school yard.

Mr. Anthony Spann, Santa Barbara Trust for Historic Preservation (SBTHP), commented that the plans should show the alignment of De La Guerra Street across the west side of Santa Barbara Street and how it affects the property.

Mr. Jarrell Jackman, SBTHP, pointed out that the proposed condo project is within the boundaries of El Presidio de Santa Barbara and stated that the plan does not address the future Phase 3 reconstruction of the Presidio.

Mr. Kellam De Forest, resident, expressed concern that the proposed buildings will make the historic adobe columns, on the old neighborhood house building, even further obscured from public view than they are now.

Public comment closed at 3:46 p.m.

Straw votes: How many Commissioners would support an eight foot minimum setback? 6/1/0. (Naylor opposed.)

How many Commissioners would agree with a five foot setback? 5/2/0.

How many Commissioners would support a one-story building on the property line with the second-floor set back 10 feet? 7/0/0.

Motion: Continued two weeks with the following comments: 1) The observation is that this is a strongly contextual corner and at the heart of El Pueblo Viejo District. 2) Consideration needs to be made for the building’s proximity to the possible future reconstruction and expansion of the Presidio in its context to a national state park. 3) The architecture is generally acceptable. 4) There should be a reduction in size, bulk, and scale with the aim to provide a buffer from the adjacent properties to the north and east. 5) Maximize any landscaping to the extent possible, with the inclusion of skyline trees. The courtyard should be given careful consideration, particularly to include significant landscaping. 6) Careful consideration should be given to outside areas, particularly those adjacent to public areas and sidewalks. 7) The Commission supports any reduction in public paving, including the bulb-out and the realignment of the corner, and would hope that would result in the realignment of any paving to the benefit of landscaping.

Action: Suding/Naylor, 7/0/0. (Murray/Rager absent.)
HISTORIC LANDMARKS COMMISSION
MINUTES

Wednesday, November 15, 2006 David Gebhard Public Meeting Room: 630 Garden Street
1:30 P.M.

COMMISSION MEMBERS:
PHILIP SUDING, Chair – Present
WILLIAM LA VOIE, Vice-Chair – Present
LOUise BOUCHER – Present until 7:29 p.m.
STEVE HAUSZ – Present
VADIM HSU – Present from 1:36 p.m. to 4:05 p.m.
and 4:49 p.m. to 5:38 p.m.
ALEX PUJO – Present
CAREN RAGER – Present
FERMINA MURRAY – Present
SUSETTE NAYLOR – Present

ADVISORY MEMBER:
DR. MICHAEL GLASSOW – Absent

CITY COUNCIL LIAISON:
ROGER HORTON – Absent

PLANNING COMMISSION LIAISON:
WILLIAM MAHAN – Absent

STAFF:
BETTIE WEISS, CITY PLANNER – Present from 1:33 p.m. to 1:38 p.m.
JAN HUBBELL, SENIOR PLANNER – Present from 2:09 p.m. to 2:41 p.m.
JAIME LIMÓN, Design Review Supervisor – Present until 2:13 p.m.
JAKE JACOBUS, Urban Historian – Present until 6:18 p.m.
DEBRA ANDALORO, Project Planner – Present from 1:39 p.m. to 2:09 p.m.
SUSAN GANTZ, Planning Technician II – Present
GABRIELA FELICIANO, Commission Secretary – Present

800 SANTA BARBARA ST C-2 Zone
(4:48) Assessor's Parcel Number: 031-012-028
Application Number: MST2006-00129
Owner: 800 Santa Barbara Street Investment Company
Applicant: Suzanne Elledge Planning and Permitting Services
Architect: Cearnal Andrulaitis Architects
Landscape Architect: Van Atta & Associates

(Proposal to demolish an existing 1,965 square foot office building and construct a three-story mixed-use project comprised of eight residential and two commercial condominium units on an 18,713 square foot parcel. Thirty underground parking spaces would be provided. Planning Commission approval will be required for a lot line adjustment of 1,529 square feet from adjacent parcel number 031-012-027 to meet residential density requirements.)

(Second Concept Review.)

(COMMENTS ONLY; PROJECT REQUIRES ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT AND PLANNING COMMISSION APPROVAL.)

Present: Brian Cearnal, Architect
Suzanne Elledge, SEPPS
Alexandra Cole, Architectural Historian
Public comment opened at 4:56 p.m.

Mr. Kellam De Forest, local resident, commented that it is important that the view line from Santa Barbara Street to the fountain and the old neighborhood house with its historic adobe columns be retained. He requested that the pathway be as wide as possible and commented that there should be a straight-view into the pathway and adobe.

Ms. Mary Louise Days, local resident, commented that this is one of the most historic neighborhoods in downtown Santa Barbara and that there is no necessity for a three-story portion and suggested that a second story be given a great deal of thought. Also commented that a six foot setback on the street frontage is not appropriate and should be much higher.

Mr. Jarrell Jackman, Santa Barbara Trust for Historic Preservation, provided a rendering that shows the City and State approved area that will eventually be reconstructed for the Presidio. The drawing also indicates how the restored Presidio is to look when approached from Santa Barbara Street and he expressed concern about this project affecting that view.

Mr. Gordon Sichi, Head Master of Anacapa School, commented on two issues that may affect the school: 1) nuisance complaints from the adjacent residents due to the student noise; and 2) student safety during the building process.

Mr. Eric Lassen, Anacapa School Board of Trustees, expressed appreciation for the improvements that the applicant has made to the plans.

Public comment closed at 5:01 p.m.

Straw votes: How many Commissioners could support the throat as presented? 6/3/0.

How many Commissioners could support a third-story element? 5/4/0.

Motion: Continued four weeks with the following comments: 1) The current proposal shows much improvement over the last presentation. 2) The axial layout is appreciated and appropriate; however, some of the Commissioners feel that the narrowest part of the throat on the central axis should be opened up. 3) The Commission appreciates the input from the users of the existing site. 4) At least one Commissioner felt the bridge may be problematic. 5) At least three Commissioners would request a larger than six foot setback on the northwest corner. 6) The applicant should provide a photomontage of a third-story element.

Action: La Voie/Hausz, 9/0/0. Motion carried.
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HISTORIC STRUCTURES/SITES REPORT
800 SANTA BARBARA STREET
SANTA BARBARA, CALIFORNIA
APN 031-012-028

1. INTRODUCTION

The following Historic Structures/Sites Report for 800 Santa Barbara Street was requested by the owner, Tom Foley, and Suzanne Elledge, because the building is older than 50 years and is adjacent to a potential City Structure of Merit, the former Neighborhood House at 223 East De La Guerra Street. This study was conducted to analyze the potential effects of the project upon the building (see Figure 1 for vicinity map and Appendix for architectural drawings). The report meets the Master Environmental Assessment requirements for a Historical Study. Alexandra C. Cole of Preservation Planning Associates prepared the report.

2. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The proposed project involves demolishing the existing 1,965 square foot one-story office building at 800 Santa Barbara Street and constructing a mixed use project with eight residential condominiums, totaling 15,997 square feet, two commercial condominiums, totaling 22,281 square feet, and a 30-space underground parking structure, totaling 14,560 square feet, opening off the De La Guerra Street existing driveway. The condominiums are configured around a central courtyard in two main buildings. The majority of the project is two stories, with a three-story element at the northeast corner of the property. The existing flagpole will be relocated to the adjacent property at 223 East De La Guerra Street. The conceptual elevations, prepared by Cearnal Andralaitis LLC and dated August 10, 2006 (Sheets A0.0, A1.1, A2.1), were reviewed for this report and are appended.

3. DOCUMENTS REVIEW

The following sources within the City of Santa Barbara Master Environmental Assessment Guidelines for Archaeological Resources and Historic Structures and Sites (January 2002) were consulted to see if the building had already been declared an historic resource: “Designated Historic Structures/Sites” (Appendix B) and “City of Santa Barbara Potential Historic Structures/Sites List” (Appendix C). The building was not listed as a City Structure of Merit or Landmark. However, during an architectural survey carried out in 1978, the adjacent Neighborhood House, then also at the address 800 Santa Barbara Street (now 223 East De La Guerra Street after a lot split in 1997) was declared eligible for the California Register of Historic Resources as the work of Soule, Murphy and Hastings (Belsher: 1978).

4. SITE HISTORY

The land comprising present-day Santa Barbara originally was the home of the Barbareño Chumash, who settled along the coast from Carpinteria to Goleta. A Chumash village, Syukhtun was located along Cabrillo Boulevard and a second, Taynayan, inland near Pedregosa (Mission) Creek on the upper East side. When Spain began to colonize California with
missions and pueblos, this land was claimed by King Carlos of Spain and then granted to the Franciscan fathers when the Presidio and Mission were founded in Santa Barbara between 1782-1786. The area became part of the Pueblo lands of Santa Barbara to be used by the Mission and the Presidio.

When Mexico became independent from Spain in 1822, it secularized the missions and sold off their lands in an attempt to break the Spanish hold in California. When California became a state in 1850, the newly-established City of Santa Barbara inherited the Pueblo lands and hired Captain Salisbury Haley to survey the town, laying upon the former winding streets of the pueblo an American grid pattern composed of blocks, streets, and parks. A three-member committee consisting of Eugene Lyes, Antonio Maria De la Guerra and Joaquin Carrillo was appointed by the mayor and Common Council to name the new streets created by the Haley survey. Because two of the members of this committee were Californios, many of the street names referred to names of early explorers, settlers, or events related to the history of Santa Barbara from its inception in 1782 until the survey in 1851.

The land where the building at 800 Santa Barbara Street is now located lies in Block 172 of the City, as laid out by the Haley survey, bounded by Santa Barbara, East De La Guerra, Garden, and East Canon Perdido Streets. Santa Barbara Street was named in honor of the patron saint of the City, De la Guerra Street for Jose De La Guerra, fifth Comandante of the Presidio, Garden Street which passes through the de la Guerra/Presidio gardens which were located at Cota and Ortega Streets, and Canon Perdido for a Presidio cannon lost in 1858 (Days 1986: 193-5).

Although the streets were nicely laid out in the Wackenreuder Map of 1853 which codified the Haley Survey, in actuality the town was little developed at this time. In fact, De la Guerra Street had to be laid out with a jog between Santa Barbara and Garden Streets because of the location of an adobe in the street near the Garden Street intersection (Wackenreuder Map of 1853). The 1870s became a time of great growth and change in downtown Santa Barbara. This change was fueled in part by the advertising of journalist Charles Nordhoff, working for the New York Tribune, who visited Santa Barbara in 1872 and then wrote California - A Book for Travelers and Settlers, which introduced the benefits of the Santa Barbara climate. As well the construction of Stearns Wharf, with its ability to handle both passenger ships and freighters, enabled redwood to be shipped cheaply from northern California to provide building materials for new houses, which were modeled on eastern and Midwestern architectural styles, such as Italianate, Eastlake and Queen Anne, rather than the earlier Hispanic adobe houses. The population of Santa Barbara rapidly expanded, as Anglos settled and developed the downtown State Street area, from Gutierrez to De la Guerra Streets, with brick commercial buildings housing all the services a fledgling town needed, such as hotels, restaurants, grocery stores, billiard parlors, saloons, variety stores, livery stables, dry goods shops, millinery shops, a post office, liquor stores, drug stores, butcher shops, barber shops, cigar stores, and lumber yards.

The 1853 Wackenreuder Map shows the subject property with the Teodoro Arrellanes adobe on it, which was built in 1795 (see Figure 2). Arrellanes was the owner of the Guadalupe Ranch as well as parts of Santa Maria. This adobe was well-situated, just outside the Presidio grounds as well as being close to the De la Guerra gardens. The 1870 and 1878 Maps of the Town of Santa Barbara show block 172 with the Arrellanes adobe and a large field in front of it along Santa Barbara Street.
Over the years a number of additions of wood were made to the rear and south side of the adobe. By 1893, the imposing Queen Anne Sloyd School had been built on a portion of the front yard facing Santa Barbara Street (see Figure 3). Upon Teodoro Arrellanes' death, a one-half interest in the adobe went to his son Luis and the other one-half interest to his daughter Maria Ignacia Elizalde, who in turn willed her portion to her son Julius J. Elizalde.

In 1910, the widows of Luis Arrellanes and Julius Elizalde sold the house to the Associated Charities of Santa Barbara County. This organization was formed in 1899 in Santa Barbara in response to the Depression of 1890 which found many families, including many immigrants, out of work and in need of food, clothing and a place to live. A group of Santa Barbara citizens organized to help these families once again become self-sufficient, and this group became the County's first organized social service agency (Leone 1999: 25).

Their first office was at 720 Anacapa Street, which they soon outgrew. The purchase of the adobe gave them a facility adequate for their developing programs. They added two wings, one housing the Industrial Department activities and the other housing the agency's thrift store. At the same time, during the remodel, they replaced the original porch posts with decorative posts from the inner porch of the Aguirre adobe on Carrillo Street, which had been salvaged from a pile of discarded lumber at the rear of the Aguirre adobe property (Cullimore 1945: 15).

Shortly afterwards, The Neighborhood House Association of Santa Barbara moved into the adobe as well. Their purpose was to prevent juvenile delinquency by offering a number of varied activities to the local youth. Their portion of the adobe was remodeled to be a club house.
for the boys and girls of the neighborhood, providing such amenities as meeting rooms, a
dibrary, a loom-room, kitchen, classroom for girls, an assembly and game room, reception room,
and an outdoor gym with tennis and basketball courts. Later a bandstand and a dancing
platform were added to the grounds. Margaret Baylor established a recreational program there

Figure 3. 1907 Sanborn Map

5. ARCHITECTURAL AND SOCIAL HISTORY

The remodeled adobe was badly damaged in the 1925 earthquake and subsequently razed. In
1927, John Murphy of Soule, Hastings and Murphy built a new much larger building on the
property, further east and south than the original adobe. Its central linear portion is reminiscent
of the original adobe, and once again the Aguirre porch columns were reused (City Building
Permit A-2461, dated March 23, 1927). Alexander MacKellar was the contractor (see Figure 4.
Sanborn Map of 1930). At the same time, a new garage and carpentry shop building was constructed at the rear of the lot behind the new building (City Permit A-3641, dated December 2, 1927). Very probably at this time the sandstone retaining wall was added along De La Guerra and Santa Barbara Streets, for the 1930 Sanborn Map shows the corner of the parcel rounded. Whereas earlier maps show a right-angle corner.

Figure 4. 1930 Sanborn Map

In 1938, Associated Charities officially renamed itself Neighborhood House to reflect the change in its goal from meeting individual family’s needs to organizing group work to serve children with activities such as fine arts, theater, story hour, music, sports, and camping trips, as well as Mother-Child workshops. During these years, into the 1940s, Neighborhood House was also becoming the welfare service center for Santa Barbara. In 1948, to further this aim of uniting services under one roof, Neighborhood House built an office building (the subject building) at the front of the property to house the Community Chest (later the United Way). As well it rented rooms in the building at a reduced rate for other social service organizations (Leone 1999: 35, 39).

The contractor for the building, and presumably the designer as well, as no architect or engineer is listed on the building permit, was Harold John Vaile (City Building Permit D-1945, dated December 15, 1948). The address has been variously listed as 201 or 205 East De La Guerra Street, and 802 or 806 Santa Barbara Street. Over the next almost thirty-five years, the building
Street, and 802 or 806 Santa Barbara Street. Over the next almost thirty-five years, the
building was used for the Community Chest, Social Service exchange, volunteer Bureau,
Associated In-Group Donors, Memorial Rehabilitation Foundation, and the Freedom
Community Clinic.

In 1953, Neighborhood House again changed its outreach focus, from group work to
family service, and as well changed its name to the Family Service Agency. In 1981, in
need of funds, the Family Service Agency sold the property to Barry Berkus and it as
well as the United Way moved out of the buildings. Since 1981, a number of businesses
have rented 800 Santa Barbara Street, the most recent being Suzanne Elledge Permit and
Planning Services.

Barry Berkus owned the buildings as De La Guerra Court Investments from 1981 until
1996, at which time Thomas G. Foley of FBK Investments LLC bought them. In 1997, a
lot split codified the address of the subject building as 800 Santa Barbara Street and the
former 800 as 223 East Canon Perdido Street. In 2006, 800 Santa Barbara Street LLC is
listed as the owner of the property.

Figure 5. Detail showing new office building. 1930 corrected to 1950 Sanborn Map
6. FIELD INVENTORY

Setting

The one-story office building is rectangular, and oriented east/west, with the short side facing Santa Barbara Street and the long side facing De La Guerra Street. It is surrounded on the east and south by parking, and on the west by lawn and mature trees, such as black acacia, palm, olive, pittosporum, jacaranda, and pepper. To the north, separated by a wood fence, is the Anacapa School building, to the east is the large office building at 223 East De La Guerra Street, to the south is De la Guerra Street, and to the west is Santa Barbara Street.

A red brick path leads from the sidewalk at Santa Barbara Street past the front of the building to 223 East De La Guerra Street. The building sits higher on the lot than that at 223 East De La Guerra Street, and is surrounded on the east side by a sandstone retaining wall. Another low sandstone retaining wall runs along the perimeter of the property on Santa Barbara and East De La Guerra Streets; this wall very probably was added when Neighborhood House was constructed in 1927. A flagpole, made from the mast of a ship, is located on the brick path near the steps leading down to 223 E. De La Guerra Street, and possibly came from the Aguirre adobe (Tompkins 1972).

This property lies very near the heart of historic Santa Barbara, a stone's throw from the Presidio's outer defense wall. Down De La Guerra Street from the property towards State Street are the Casa De La Guerra, the Plaza De La Guerra, the Orena adobes, the Orena store, the El Presidio building which encapsulates an old adobe, Presidio Avenue, the oldest street in Santa Barbara, the Santiago De La Guerra adobe, and the Lugo adobe, incorporated into the Meridian studios. All of these are either City Landmarks or potential historic structures. Across De La Guerra Street is the Historical Society Museum, on the City's potentials list, with its Covarrubias and Historic adobes moved onto the site, both City Landmarks.

Adjacent to the property along Santa Barbara Street is the site of the Sloyd School, an 1893 Queen Anne public school, on the City's potential list. A casualty of the 1925 earthquake, it was demolished in 1930, and in 1947, the present Anacapa School building at 814 Santa Barbara Street was moved onto the site for the Board of Education by the Federal Works Administration from a location along De La Guerra Street. Immediately beyond is the City Landmark Rochin adobe (1856), the first adobe built outside the Presidio walls, which utilized a number of the adobe bricks from that complex.

The building lies within the El Pueblo Viejo Landmark District, and in the Laguna Neighborhood, identified in the Land Use Element of the City's General Plan as bounded on the north by Sola, Olive, and Micheltorena Streets, on the east by Milpas Street, on the south by Cota Street, and on the west by Santa Barbara Street. This neighborhood is primarily residential in its eastern and northern portions, with mixed residential and commercial on the west side as it merges with the Downtown area (The City of Santa Barbara General Plan. Land Use Element. 1964). The site is zoned C-2.
Description

The shallow-pitched side-gabled roof is covered with red tiles and the walls are clad in stucco. The widely-overhanging eaves are supported on open rafters with rounded tails. A stucco-clad chimney pierces the south slope of the roof. The chief decorative feature of this otherwise plain building is the recessed entry porch with brick floor supported on four square stucco-clad posts. Decorative wood grilles infill the space between the side columns and the wall.

Vertically-oriented twelve-pane steel sash windows, both fixed and casement, topped by transoms, flank the recessed wood frame and glass paired entry doors. Similar windows are located on the north and east elevations. On the west and north elevation are horizontally-oriented 16-pane steel sash windows. Smaller steel-sash paired four-pane and three-pane casement windows light the north elevation.

Alterations

There do not appear to have been any exterior alterations, with the possible exception of the front door, which looks more recent than the rest of the building, although I did not find a building permit specific to this change. Over time various tenant improvements or repairs have been made to the interior, the last in 2004 when a fire damaged the interior.

7. DETERMINATION OF SIGNIFICANCE

Criteria of Significance

To judge whether a building is significant, the City’s Master Environmental Assessment Guidelines uses criteria provided by CEQA and City Guidelines. Under CEQA Guideline §15064.5(a) historic resources include the following:

(1) A resource listed in, or determined to be eligible by the State Historical Resources Commission, for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources (Pub. Res. Code §5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4850 et seq.)

(2) A resource included in a local register of historical resources, as defined in §5020.1(k) of the Public Resources Code or identified as significant in an historical resource survey meeting the requirements of §5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code, shall be presumed to be historically or culturally significant. Public agencies must treat any such resource as significant unless the preponderance of evidence demonstrates that it is not historically or culturally significant.

(3) Any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California may be considered to be an historical resource, providing the lead agency’s determination is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record. Generally, a resource shall be considered by the lead agency to be “historically significant” if the resource meets the criteria for listing on the California Register of Historic Resources (Pub. Res. Code §5024.1, Title 14 CCR,
Section 4852) including the following:
(A) Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad
patterns of California’s history and cultural heritage;
(B) Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;
(C) Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of
construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or
possesses high artistic values; or
(D) Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or
history.
(4) The fact that a resource is not listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in the
California Register of Historic Resources, not included in a local register of historical
resources (pursuant to section 5020.1 (k) of the Public Resources Code, or identified
in an historical resources survey (meeting the criteria in §5024.1(g) of the Public
Resources Code) does not preclude a lead agency from determining that the resource
may be an historical resource as defined in Public Resources Code sections 5020.1(j)
or 5024.1.

Under City of Santa Barbara Guidance, a significant historic resource includes but is not limited
to:

1. Any structure, site or object designated on the most current version of the
following lists: National Historic Landmarks, National Register of Historic Places,
California Registered Historical Landmark, California Register of Historical Resources,
City of Santa Barbara Landmarks, City of Santa Barbara Structures of Merit.

2. Selected structures that are representative of particular styles including vernacular as
well as high styles, architectural styles that were popular fifty or more years ago, or
structures that are embodiments of outstanding attention to architectural design, detail,
materials, or craftsmanship.

3. Any structure, site or object meeting any or all criteria established for a City Landmark
and a City Structure of Merit (Municipal Code, Chapter 22.22.040, Ord. 3900 ¶1, 1977),
as follows:

A. Its character, interest or value as a significant part of the heritage of the City, the State
or the Nation;
B. Its location as the site of a significant historic event;
C. Its identification with a person or persons who significantly contributed to the culture
and development of the City, the State or the Nation;
D. Its exemplification of a particular architectural style or way of life important to the City,
the State, or the Nation;
E. Its exemplification as the best remaining architectural type in its neighborhood;
F. Its identification as the creation, design, or work of a person or persons whose effort has
significantly influenced the heritage of the City, the State or the Nation;
G. Its embodiment of elements demonstrating outstanding attention to architectural
design, detail, materials, or craftsmanship;
H. Its relationship to any other landmark if its preservation is essential to the integrity of that landmark;
I. Its unique location or singular physical characteristic representing an established and familiar visual feature of a neighborhood;
J. Its potential of yielding significant information of archaeological interest;
K. Its integrity as a natural environment that strongly contributes to the well-being of the people of the City, the State or the Nation.

4. Any structure, site or object meeting any or all of the criteria provided for the National Register of Historic Places and the California Historical Landmark list, as follows:
The quality of significance in American history, architecture, archeology, engineering, and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects of State and local importance that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association, and
A. That are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or
B. That are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or
C. That embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
D. That have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

5. Any structure, site, or object associated with a traditional way of life important to an ethnic, national, racial, or social group, or to the community at large; or illustrates the broad patterns of cultural, social, political, economic, or industrial history.

6. Any structure, site or object that conveys an important sense of time and place, or contributes to the overall visual character of a neighborhood or district.

7. Any structure, site, or object able to yield information important to the community or is relevant to historical, historic archaeological, ethnographic, folkloric, or geographical research.

8. Any structure, site or object determined by the City to be historically significant or significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, educational, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California, provided the City's determination is based on substantial evidence in light of the whole record [Ref. State CEQA Guidelines §15064.5(a)(3)].
8. FINDING OF SIGNIFICANCE

Conclusion

The office building at 800 Santa Barbara Street is not considered eligible as a City Structure of Merit or Landmark according to City Landmarks criteria. However, the sandstone perimeter wall is considered significant as a Structure of Merit as a landscape feature under Criterion “T”. According to the project arborist, none of the trees on site have particular historic value or age (Personal conversation with arborist Peter J. H. Winn, August 2006).

Analysis of Significance

800 Santa Barbara Street

California Register of Historic Resources

The building at 800 Santa Barbara Street was surveyed in 1978 as part of the larger Family Services Agency property. It was not mentioned, but the adjacent building at 223 East De La Guerra Street was singled out for the State Historic Resources Inventory for its architect, John Murphy of Soule Murphy and Hastings.

City of Santa Barbara Landmark or Structure of Merit

To be considered as a potential Landmark or Structure of Merit a building must retain integrity of location, materials, design, and setting and meet one of the above criteria.

The building retains integrity of location, materials, design and setting. It retains integrity of location because it has not been moved. It retains integrity of materials, such as stucco walls, tile roof, and steel-sash multi-paned windows. It has not been altered and retains integrity of design. Its setting, with lawn, mature trees, and brick sidewalk has not been altered.

Criterion A. This building is an attractive post-war rendition of the Spanish Colonial Revival style with its simple lines and repetitive steel sash windows with transoms. The brick porch floor and connecting brick path and semicircular brick steps add to its context. However, its design does not rise to the level of a Structure of Merit, and it is therefore not considered to have exceptional character, interest or value as a significant part of the heritage of the City. It is not eligible under Criterion A.

Criterion B. The building was not the location of a significant event. It is not eligible under Criterion B.

Criterion C. The building is associated with the United Way and other social service organizations. However, it is not identified with a person or persons who significantly contributed to the culture and development of the City, the State or the Nation. It is not eligible under Criterion C.
**Criterion D.** This building is an attractive post-war rendition of the Spanish Colonial Revival style with its simple lines and repetitive steel sash windows with transoms. However, it is not considered an exemplary example of the Spanish Colonial Revival style, and its design does not rise to the level of a Structure of Merit. It is not eligible under criterion D.

**Criterion E.** This building is not the best example of its type in the neighborhood. The adjacent building at 225 East De La Guerra Street is a better example of the Spanish Colonial Revival style. It is not eligible under Criterion E.

**Criterion F.** The building was designed by Harold John Vaile, a Santa Barbara builder whose work is not well-known in Santa Barbara. He remodeled the Vincent E. Wood Auto Building in 1946 (now demolished for the crosstown freeway), and designed a dining hall addition for the Little Town Club in 1948. He graduated from Crane Institute of Technology in Chicago, then came to Los Angeles where he worked for Carleton Winslow and Reginald Johnson. He moved to Santa Barbara in 1933 to supervise the construction work of the Johnson-designed Clark mansion near the Bird Refuge. When that job ended, he opened an office in Santa Barbara in 1935, where he was a designer and builder until 1967 ("Harold J. Vaile, 88; Santa Barbara Builder":1988). Vaile’s work has not significantly influenced Santa Barbara architecture. It is not eligible under Criterion F.

**Criterion G.** This building is an attractive post-war rendition of the Spanish Colonial Revival style with its simple lines and repetitive steel sash windows with transoms. However, it does not embody elements demonstrating outstanding attention to architectural design, detail, materials, or craftsmanship. It is not eligible under Criterion G.

**Criterion H.** Although not immediately adjacent to any City Landmark, the property is surrounded by a number of early adobes remaining from the time of Santa Barbara’s settlement which are City Landmarks. These include the Historic and Covarrubias adobes, and the Rochin adobe. However, the preservation of the building at 800 Santa Barbara Street as well as the landscaping is not essential to the integrity of these landmarks. It is not eligible under Criterion H.

**Criterion I.** It is not a familiar and established feature of the neighborhood. It is not eligible under Criterion I.

**Criterion J.** This criterion is not applicable under the purview of this report.

**Criterion K.** This criterion is not applicable.

**Criterion 1.** The building is not eligible under Criterion 1 because it is not listed on the National Register of Historic Places and the California Register of Historic Resources.

**Criterion 2.** The building is not eligible under Criterion 2 because it does not embody outstanding attention to architectural design, detail, materials, or craftsmanship.

**Criterion 4.** The building is not eligible under criterion 4 because it is not listed on the National Register of Historic Places or on the California Historic Landmark list.
Criterion 5. The building is not eligible under Criterion 5 because it is not associated with a traditional way of life nor does it illustrate broad patterns of cultural, social, political, economic, or industrial history.

Criterion 6. The building is not eligible under Criterion 6 because it does not contribute to the overall visual character of the neighborhood. Set back from the street, it is quite hidden behind the extensive landscaping. However the landscaping contributes to the visual character of the neighborhood.

Criterion 7. The building is not eligible under Criterion 7. It is not able to yield information relevant to historical, historic archaeological, ethnographic, folkloric, or geographical research.

Criterion 8. The building is not eligible under Criterion 8 because it is not listed on the CRHR.

Sandstone Perimeter Retaining Wall

The sandstone perimeter wall is considered eligible under Criterion "T" and Criterion 6 as a familiar and established feature of this corner, dating to the 1920s, and considered a part of the old Neighborhood House landscaping.

9. ASSESSMENT OF IMPACTS OF THE PROJECT

CEQA Guidelines for Determining Project Effects

CEQA defines a potential adverse effect as one that would cause a substantial change in the significance of a resource. Such a substantial change means demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the physical characteristics of the resource or its immediate surroundings that justify its eligibility for the CRHR or its inclusion in a local register of historic resources (PRC Section 15064.5 (b) (1,2)).

According to the latest CEQA guidelines, if a project involving significant historical resources follows The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties With Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings (Standards) (Weeks and Grimmer 1995), the project is considered to be mitigated to a level of less than a significant impact on the historic resource (PRC Section 15064.5 (b) (3)). The Standards are as follows:

1. A property shall be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.
2. The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.
3. Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, shall not be undertaken.
4. Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.

5. Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.

6. Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

7. Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used.

8. Archeological resources shall be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.

9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a way that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

Analysis of Proposed Project According to CEQA Guidelines

Summary

The building is not considered an historic resource according to CEQA standards. Therefore its demolition is not considered an historic impact. It is being reviewed primarily because of its context adjacent to a potential historic resource, the 1927 Soule Murphy and Hastings building to the east. However the perimeter sandstone retaining wall, associated with the 1927 building, is considered eligible as a City Structure of Merit under Criterion “I” and Criterion 6. The individual trees on the property are not considered significant, but the extensive landscaping has become a familiar visual feature of the streetscape and will be considered in the analysis of the potential impacts of the project. The Standard that is relevant to analyze the proposed project is Standard 9.

Analysis

9. “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.”

The character-defining features of the site are the sandstone retaining wall which was very probably added when the building at 223 East De La Guerra Street was constructed. As
well, the extensive landscaping, although not considered significant, nevertheless defines the corner where the project will be located.

The proposed project is designed in the Spanish Colonial Revival style, as required in the El Pueblo Viejo district. It is set back sufficiently from the potentially significant building at 223 East De La Guerra Street so that all the elevations and courtyard landscape features of that building which face the proposed project continue to be visually and actually separated from the new buildings. The two-story massing matches the two-story portion of the building at 223 East De La Guerra Street. The third story portion is set back from the one-story wing of the building at 223 East De La Guerra Street a sufficient distance that it does not loom. The Monterey balcony elements are sufficiently distinct from the architectural details of the building at 223 East De La Guerra Street, to differentiate the new buildings from the old. The project is compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale, and proportion and massing of the existing building.

The property, as mentioned above, is set within the neighborhood of a number of Landmark adobes, as well as other buildings on the City’s potential list. However, because it is sufficiently removed from them, its presence as a larger-scale building will not impact these historic buildings. The Historic and Covarrubias adobes are hidden behind the Historical Society building, the Rochin adobe is located two doors down from the proposed building site, and then remaining historic buildings dating from the first settlement of Santa Barbara are at least a block away along De La Guerra Street.

The perimeter wall is incorporated into the project. The two-story building facing East De La Guerra Street is set back from the sidewalk, behind a sandstone privacy wall, which in turn has been set back from the perimeter wall to allow for planting, presumably the same agaves which are there now. The commercial building on Santa Barbara Street is also set back from the perimeter wall to allow for a planting strip. There will be three large landscape pockets for new trees. Several of the trees are called out to be saved, one of them the black acacia near the corner. However, that is the one which is pushing out the perimeter wall, and its preservation would further damage the historic resource.

In my professional opinion, the proposed project meets Standard 9 with the exception of the retention of the above-mentioned black acacia tree. Because the wall is significant under Criterion “I”, retention of the black acacia tree that is pushing this wall out of alignment would cause a potentially significant mitigatable impact (Class II). With the required mitigation measures listed below, the project, according to CEQA criteria, would be considered to be mitigated to a level of less than a significant impact on the historic resource (PRC Section 15064.5 (b) (3)).

10. REQUIRED ACTION/MITIGATION MEASURES

1. The black acacia tree that is pushing the perimeter wall out of alignment shall be removed and the wall repaired. Any new plantings of trees shall be set back sufficiently from this wall that they will not damage the wall.
2. Where the perimeter wall needs to be cut through for new use, the existing configuration of the wall cuts, such as that for the brick walkway, shall be copied.

11. RESIDUAL IMPACTS

After implementation of the required mitigation measures listed above, a potentially significant but mitigable (Class II) impact would be reduced to an adverse but not significant impact (Class III).
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13. PLATES


Plate 7. South and east elevations with brick steps. Facing northwest.
Susan McLaughlin. June 2006


Plate 13. View of the property from Santa Barbara Street, showing extensive landscaping and low sandstone perimeter retaining wall. Facing east. A. C. Cole. July 2006

Plate 15. View looking northeast of the property from De La Guerra Street, showing landscaping and low sandstone perimeter retaining wall. Facing northeast. A. C. Cole. July 2006

Plate 16. View showing how black acacia and landscaping is pushing the sandstone wall Out of alignment. Facing west. A. C. Cole. July 2006


Plate 20. View of sandstone retaining wall and brick steps at paved area separating 223 East De La Guerra Street from 800 Santa Barbara Street. Facing northwest. A. C. Cole. July 2006
Plate 21. Detail of brick steps and sandstone retaining wall. Facing northwest.
A. C. Cole. July 2006

Plate 25. View of 223 East De La Guerra Street across common parking area.

Plate 26. View of 223 East De La Guerra Street across common parking area.
Plate 27. View of 223 East De La Guerra Street across common parking area.

Plate 28. View of 223 East De La Guerra Street at the entrance to the common parking area.
Plate 29. Santa Barbara Historical Museum at the southwest corner of De La Guerra and Santa Barbara Streets. Facing southwest. A. C. Cole, August 2006

Plate 30. Commercial building at the northwest corner of De La Guerra and Santa Barbara Streets. Facing northwest. A. C. Cole, August 2006
Plate 31. Southeast corner of Santa Barbara and De La Guerra Streets, showing parking lot with 800 Santa Barbara Street in background. Facing north. A. C. Cole, August 2006


Plate 34. Presidio Avenue on De La Guerra Street between Anacapa and Santa Barbara Streets. Facing northwest. A. C. Cole. August 2006
14. APPENDIX
March 7, 2007

Members of the Historic Landmarks Commission
630 Garden Street
Santa Barbara, CA 93102

Re: Letter Addendum to Historic Structures/Sites Report for 800 Santa Barbara Street,
APN031-012-028

The Historic Structures/Sites Report for 800 Santa Barbara Street, prepared by
Alexandra C. Cole of Preservation Planning Associates and dated August 2006, was
presented and accepted at the Historical Landmarks Commission’s meeting on August
16, 2006. Since that time, revised conceptual plans for the site and building design have
been developed, which were reviewed by the Historic Landmarks Commission on
January 10, 2007. This letter addendum to the Historic Structures Report addresses the
impacts from these revised plans prepared by Cearnal Andrunaitis LLC and dated
letter.

Findings of Significance for 800 Santa Barbara Street

As the previous Historic Structures Report for the office building at 800 Santa Barbara
Street determined, it is not considered eligible as a City Structure of Merit or Landmark
according to City Landmarks criteria and therefore is not a historic resource according
to CEQA guidelines. Its demolition will not have a significant impact. However, the
sandstone perimeter wall is considered significant as a Structure of Merit as a landscape
feature under Criterion “1” and Criterion 6 as a familiar and established feature of this
corner, dating to the 1920s, and considered a part of the old Neighborhood House
landscaping. According to the project arborist, Peter Winn, none of the trees on site
have particular historic value or age. The individual trees on the property are not
considered significant, but the extensive landscaping has become a familiar visual
feature of the streetscape and is considered an important component of the site
(Preservation Planning Associates 2006).

The site itself is important historically. This property lies very near the heart of historic
Santa Barbara, a stone’s throw from the Presidio’s outer defense wall. Down De La
Guerra Street from the property towards State Street are the Casa De La Guerra, the
Santiago De La Guerra adobe, and the Lugo adobe, incorporated into the Meridian
studios. All of these are either City Landmarks or potential historic structures. Across

EXHIBIT F
Plaza De La Guerra, the Orena adobes, the Orena store, the El Presidio building which encapsulates an old adobe, Presidio Avenue, the oldest street in Santa Barbara, the De La Guerra Street is the Historical Society Museum, on the City’s potentials list, with its Covarrubias adobe and the Historic adobe, both City Landmarks.

Immediately beyond the Anacapa School building at 814 Santa Barbara Street is the City Landmark Rochin adobe (1856), the first adobe built outside the Presidio walls, which utilized a number of the adobe bricks from that complex. The adjacent building at 223 East De La Guerra Street, the former Neighborhood House, was singled out for the State Historic Resources Inventory for its architect, John Murphy of Soule Murphy and Hastings. The Historic Landmarks Commission believed that the project may have an impact upon this historic neighborhood.

Analysis of the Proposed Project (see attached drawings)

CEQA Guidelines for Determining Project Effects

CEQA defines a potential adverse effect as one that would cause a substantial change in the significance of a resource. Such a substantial change means demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the physical characteristics of the resource or its immediate surroundings that justify its eligibility for the CRHR or its inclusion in a local register of historic resources (PRC Section 15064.5 (b) (1,2)).

According to the latest CEQA guidelines, if a project involving significant historical resources follows The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties With Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings (Standards) (Weeks and Grimmer 1995), the project is considered to be mitigated to a level of less than a significant impact on the historic resource (PRC Section 15064.5 (b) (3)). The Standards are as follows:

1. A property shall be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.
2. The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.
3. Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, shall not be undertaken.
4. Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.

5. Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.

6. Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

7. Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used.

8. Archeological resources shall be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.

9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a way that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

Analysis of the proposed project

The project proposes to demolish the existing 1,965 square foot one-story office building at 800 Santa Barbara Street and replace it with a mixed use project containing 4,174 square feet of commercial space and six new condominium units totaling 10,015 square feet. An underground parking structure, totaling 12,816 square feet, will open off the De La Guerra Street existing driveway. The project is configured with two main buildings, a long two-story rectangle at the north edge of the property with a three-story element at its northeast end and a two-story U-shaped building wrapped around a central courtyard. They are separated by the existing brick pathway, flagpole, and curved brick steps on the ground floor but are linked by an open bridge at the second story level. The two-story U-shaped building facing East De La Guerra Street is set back from the sidewalk, behind a stucco privacy wall, which in turn has been set back from the perimeter wall to allow for planting of agaves. The west end of the two-story rectangular building is set back six feet from the Santa Barbara Street sidewalk behind a planting buffer.

The relevant Standard for analysis of the proposed project is Standard 9.
Impact on the site

The character-defining features of the site are the sandstone retaining wall which was very probably added when the building at 223 East De La Guerra Street was constructed. As well, the extensive landscaping, although not considered significant, nevertheless defines the corner where the project will be located. Of neighborhood concern are the axial brick path and curved steps that connect Santa Barbara Street to the original Neighborhood house at 223 East De La Guerra Street.

The sandstone retaining wall with its planting of agaves along De La Guerra and Santa Barbara Streets, as well as the brick axial path, flagpole, and curved steps will remain. Several of the existing trees will be retained, and the proposed landscape plan includes the addition of olive, pepper, and palm trees which are similar types to the existing trees, recreating the landscape buffer at the corner of De La Guerra and Santa Barbara Streets. The project meets this part of Standard 9: New construction shall not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property.

Impact on Surrounding Historic Buildings

The majority of the significant buildings mentioned above are not within the immediate vicinity of the proposed project. The historic buildings dating from the first settlement of Santa Barbara are at least a block away along De La Guerra Street. The Historic and Covarrubias adobes are hidden behind the Historical Society building, out of the viewshed of the proposed project. Additionally the U-shaped building facing the Historical Society building across East De La Guerra Street is set back 17 feet from the sidewalk with a stucco wall two feet behind the existing retaining wall and agaves, to buffer this elevation from view within the neighborhood.

The two buildings which potentially could be impacted by the project are the Rochin adobe and the former Neighborhood House. The redesign of the project has been sensitive to these buildings. The two-story building facing Santa Barbara Street has been set back six feet from the sidewalk on Santa Barbara Street to allow a view up the street towards the Rochin adobe. Its south elevation has been altered from an eaves front to a gable front which is compatible with the adjacent Anacapa School roofline. Its massing has been reduced so it is compatible with the streetscape.

As well, the buildings are set back sufficiently from the former Neighborhood House at 223 East De La Guerra Street so that all the elevations and courtyard landscape features of that building which face the proposed project continue to be visually and actually separated from the new buildings. Therefore, the project meets the remaining part of Standard 9 as well: “The new work ...shall be compatible with the historic materials, features,
Because the proposed project meets Standard 9, no mitigation measures are required.

Sincerely,

Alexandra C. Cole

Alexandra C. Cole, Principal
Attachments:
Plates
Architectural Drawings

Plate 3. View of agaves and sandstone wall to be retained.
Facing northeast. A. C. Cole, July 2006

Plate 4. View of agaves and sandstone wall to be retained.
Facing north. A. C. Cole, July 2006
October 12, 2007

Ms. Irma Unzueta  
City of Santa Barbara  
Community Development Department, Planning Division  
P.O. Box 1990  
Santa Barbara, CA 93102-1990

Dear Ms. Unzueta:

Subject: APN #: 031-012-028  
800 Santa Barbara Street, Santa Barbara, CA

The Santa Barbara County Fire Department Fire Prevention Division (FPD) Site Mitigation Unit (SMU) has reviewed the files for sites in the vicinity of the subject address. This review has indicated that shallow groundwater beneath the site may be contaminated with chlorinated solvents sourced from an up-gradient or cross-gradient source. Due to the presence of these chemicals in shallow groundwater, FPD requests that the City of Santa Barbara place the following conditions on redevelopment of the property:

1) Prior to any redevelopment, the applicant shall either (a) perform a soil vapor survey and human health risk assessment under FPD over site or (b) develop an engineered control to mitigate potential vapor intrusion into any planned on-site building using a method acceptable to FPD and consistent with the Interim Final Guidance for the Evaluation and Mitigation of Subsurface Vapor Intrusion to Indoor Air (Department of Toxic Substances Control, Dec. 15, 2004; revised February 7, 2005 or the most recent update to this document). Note that if option 1a is selected, if the results indicate a potential unacceptable risk due to vapor intrusion, engineered vapor mitigation for a future building may still be required.

2) Condition 1a or 1b shall be completed in a manner acceptable to FPD prior to issuance of a construction permit for the site.

Submit any correspondence regarding this site to my attention at: Santa Barbara County Fire Department, Fire Prevention Division, 195 West Highway 246, Buellton, CA 93427. Please do not hesitate to contact me at (805) 686-8142 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Nathan P. West  
Hazardous Materials Specialist

EXHIBIT G

[Copies: Los Alamos, Los Olivos, Mission 4]
September 12, 2007

Trish Allen
SEPPS
800 Santa Barbara Street
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

TRIP GENERATION AND INTERSECTION IMPACT ANALYSIS FOR THE
800 SANTA BARBARA STREET MIXED-USE PROJECT - CITY OF SANTA BARBARA

Associated Transportation Engineers (ATE) has prepared the following trip generation and intersection impact analysis for the 800 Santa Barbara Street Mixed-Use Project, located in the City of Santa Barbara.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project site is located at the northeast corner of the Santa Barbara Street/De La Guerra Street intersection in the City of Santa Barbara. The project is proposing to develop a mixed-use development comprised of 6 condominium units and 5,220 square feet (SF) of office space (gross). The project site currently contains a 2,111 SF office building (gross).

PROJECT TRIP GENERATION

A trip generation analysis was completed to determine the level of traffic that would be generated by the proposed development compared to the baseline level of traffic that is currently generated by the existing office building. This analysis has been completed to determine whether additional traffic data is needed for the project. The trip generation analysis is based on building floor area measured in gross square-feet (GSF), consistent with the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) methodology. The trip generation rates and assumptions used to determine trip estimates for the existing and proposed site uses are listed below.

Engineering • P
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Office. The trip rates presented in the ITE Trip Generation Report (7th Edition and 5th Edition) for General Office (Land Use Code #710) were used for this component of the project. The equation rates from the 7th Edition ITE report were used to estimate average daily and A.M. peak hour trips. The equation rates from the 5th Edition ITE Report \(^1\) were used to estimate P.M. peak hour trips. The P.M. peak hour equations from the 5th Edition were used because the equations contained in the 7th Edition report are faulty for small size office projects.

Condominiums. The ITE average rates for Residential Condominium/Townhouse (Land Use Code #230) were used for the residential component of the project.

Table 1 compares the trip generation estimates developed for the existing and proposed site uses.

### Table 1
Existing and Proposed Land Uses Trip Generation Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Average Daily</th>
<th>A.M. Peak Hour</th>
<th>P.M. Peak Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rate (a)</td>
<td>Trips</td>
<td>Rate (a)</td>
<td>Trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condominiums</td>
<td>6 Units</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>5,220 GSF</td>
<td>22.66</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>154</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>-2,111 GSF</td>
<td>22.66</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Change</td>
<td></td>
<td>106</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Rates apply to 1,000 GSF of building area.

The data presented in Table 1 show that the proposed project would result in a net increase of 106 ADT, 13 A.M. peak hour trips, and 14 P.M. peak hour trips.

Trip Distribution

Trip distribution percentages were developed for the net traffic generated by the proposed project based on existing traffic patterns observed in the study area. Trip distribution percentages are shown on Figure 1 (attached).

TRAFFIC ANALYSIS REQUIREMENTS

The City of Santa Barbara’s practice of assessing project-specific and cumulative traffic impacts involves distributing and assigning 5 or more vehicle trips through the intersections located adjacent to the project site. This practice provides a statistical certainty for determining project-generated traffic additions at critical intersections on a day-to-day basis.

Table 3 identifies the study-area intersections where the number of net project-added trips would equal or exceed the 5-trip threshold during the A.M. and P.M. peak hour period. Figure 1 (attached) shows the project-added traffic to the surrounding street network.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Project Added A.M. Peak Hour Trips</th>
<th>Project Added P.M. Peak Hour Trips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anacapa Street/Carrillo Street</td>
<td>5 Trips</td>
<td>5 Trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara Street/Carrillo Street</td>
<td>&lt;5 Trips</td>
<td>5 Trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara Street/De La Guerra Street</td>
<td>7 Trips</td>
<td>7 Trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden Street/De La Guerra Street</td>
<td>6 Trips</td>
<td>7 Trips</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 3, the proposed project would add 5 or more peak hour trips to the Anacapa Street/Carrillo Street, Santa Barbara Street/Carrillo Street, Santa Barbara Street/De La Guerra Street, and Garden Street/De La Guerra Street intersections. It is noted that the proposed project would not have the potential to impact the Santa Barbara Street/Carrillo Street intersection during the A.M. peak hour based on the City’s practice of determining project-specific impacts.

PROJECT-SPECIFIC ANALYSIS

Existing Traffic Volumes

ATE conducted A.M. and P.M. peak hour turning movement counts at the intersections listed in Table 3 in late August and early September, 2007 to determine intersection operations under existing and existing + project conditions. Figures 2 and 3 (attached) present the existing peak hour traffic volumes, and Figures 4 and 5 show the existing + project volumes.
Intersection Operations

Levels of service (LOS) for the signalized intersections were calculated based on the "Intersection Capacity Utilization" (ICU) methodology. Levels of service were calculated for unsignalized intersections using the methodology outlined in the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM)\(^2\) and are based on the weighted delay for the stop-sign controlled movements. It is noted that P.M. peak hour traffic volumes and level of service for the Anacapa Street/Carrillo Street intersection were taken from the Congestion Management Plan (CMP) monitoring report that was recently published by the Santa Barbara County Association of Governments (SBCAG). Tables 4 and 5 list the existing and existing + project levels of service and identifies project-specific impacts (LOS calculation worksheets are attached for reference).

### Table 4
**Existing + Project A.M. Peak Hour Level Of Service**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Existing V/C</th>
<th>Existing LOS</th>
<th>V/C</th>
<th>LOS</th>
<th>Existing + Project V/C</th>
<th>Existing + Project LOS</th>
<th>Impact?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anacapa Street/Carrillo Street</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara Street/Carrillo Street (a)</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara Street/De La Guerra Street</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden Street/De La Guerra Street</td>
<td>All-Way Stop</td>
<td>10.6 Sec.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>10.6 Sec.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) The project does not generate potential impacts to this intersection in the A.M. peak hour. Therefore no A.M. peak hour analysis was completed.

Table 4
Existing + Project P.M. Peak Hour Level Of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Existing + Project</th>
<th>Impact?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V/C</td>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>V/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anacapa Street/Carrillo Street</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara Street/Carrillo Street</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara Street/De La Guerra Street</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden Street/De La Guerra Street</td>
<td>All-Way Stop</td>
<td>13.2 Sec.</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>13.2 Sec.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data shown in Tables 3 and 4 show that the study-area intersections would operate at LOS A or B with the addition of project traffic. The proposed project would not generate impacts to the study-area intersections based on City thresholds.

This concludes our trip generation and intersection impact analysis for the 800 Santa Barbara Street Mixed-Use Project.

Associated Transportation Engineers

Scott A. Schell, AICP
Principal Transportation Planner

SAS/MMF

Attachments: Figure 1 – Project Trip Distribution And Assignment
Figure 2 – Existing A.M. Peak Hour Traffic Volumes
Figure 3 – Existing P.M. Peak Hour Traffic Volumes
Figure 4 – Existing + Project A.M. Peak Hour Traffic Volumes
Figure 5 – Existing + Project P.M. Peak Hour Traffic Volumes
Intersection LOS Calculation Worksheets
**Traffic Volume Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VOLUMES</th>
<th>NORTH BOUND</th>
<th>SOUTH BOUND</th>
<th>EAST BOUND</th>
<th>WEST BOUND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) EXISTING</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) PROJECT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Geometrics**

**Existing Geometrics**

**Traffic Scenarios**

Scenario 1: Existing (A)
Scenario 2: Existing + Project (A+B)

**Level of Service Calculations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOVEMENTS</th>
<th># OF LANES</th>
<th>CAPACITY</th>
<th>SCENARIO VOLUMES</th>
<th>SCENARIO V/C RATIO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NBL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0.00 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0.00 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0.00 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>74 74</td>
<td>0.00 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3200</td>
<td>538 539</td>
<td>0.19 0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBR (a)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>76 76</td>
<td>0.05 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0.00 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3200</td>
<td>498 498</td>
<td>0.16 0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBR (b)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>128 130</td>
<td>0.08 0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBL (c)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>30 30</td>
<td>0.02 0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3200</td>
<td>244 245</td>
<td>0.08 0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0.00 0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lost Time: 0.10 0.10

Intersection Capacity Utilization: 0.47 0.47

Level of Service: A A

**Notes:**

(a) 14% RTOR
(b) 27% RTOR
© Left Turn Critical, Assigned to EB #2 Lane
### Traffic Volume Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volumes</th>
<th>North Bound</th>
<th>South Bound</th>
<th>East Bound</th>
<th>West Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Existing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) Project</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Geometrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Geometrics</th>
<th>North Bound</th>
<th>South Bound</th>
<th>East Bound</th>
<th>West Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LT</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td></td>
<td>LT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Traffic Scenarios

**Scenario 1:** Existing (A)
**Scenario 2:** Existing + Project (A+B)

### Level of Service Calculations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Move- Ments</th>
<th># of Lanes</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Scenario Volumes</th>
<th>Scenario VS Ratios</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3200</td>
<td>1135</td>
<td>1130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBR (a)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3200</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBR (b)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3200</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WER</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lost Time:**

- 0.10 *

**Intersection Capacity Utilization:**

- 0.68

**Level of Service:**

- B

**Notes:**

- (a) 3% RTOR
- (b) 20% RTOR
## Traffic Volume Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VOLUMES</th>
<th>NORTH BOUND</th>
<th>SOUTH BOUND</th>
<th>EAST BOUND</th>
<th>WEST BOUND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) EXISTING</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) PROJECT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Geometrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GEOMETRICS</th>
<th>NORTH BOUND</th>
<th>SOUTH BOUND</th>
<th>EAST BOUND</th>
<th>WEST BOUND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LT</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>LT</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Traffic Scenarios

SCENARIO 1: EXISTING (A)
SCENARIO 2: EXISTING + PROJECT (A+B)

## Level of Service Calculations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOVEMENTS</th>
<th># OF LANES</th>
<th>CAPACITY</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>SCENARIO V/C RATIOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NBL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3200</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBR (a)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBL (b)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3200</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBT (c)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3200</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lost Time:**

0.10 * 0.10 *

**Intersection Capacity Utilization:**

0.50%

**Level of Service:**

A

**Notes:**

(a) 17% RTOR
(b) LEFT TURN CRITICAL, ASSIGNED TO EB #2 LANE
(c) 33% RTOR
## Traffic Volume Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volumes</th>
<th>North Bound</th>
<th>South Bound</th>
<th>East Bound</th>
<th>West Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Existing</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) Project</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Geometrics

### Existing Geometrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North Bound</th>
<th>South Bound</th>
<th>East Bound</th>
<th>West Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LT</td>
<td>RT</td>
<td>LT</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Traffic Scenarios

- **Scenario 1:** Existing (A)
- **Scenario 2:** Existing + Project (A+B)

## Level of Service Calculations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movements</th>
<th># of Lanes</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Scenario Volumes</th>
<th>Scenario V/C Ratios</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30 30</td>
<td>0.00 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3200</td>
<td>375 375</td>
<td>0.13 * 0.13 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24 29</td>
<td>0.00 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0.00 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0.00 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0.00 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>68 68</td>
<td>0.00 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>67 71</td>
<td>0.08 * 0.09 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0.00 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0.03 0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>46 46</td>
<td>0.03 0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBR (A)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>47 49</td>
<td>0.03 0.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Lost Time:

- 0.10 * 0.10 *

### Intersection Capacity Utilization:
- 0.31
- 0.32

### Level of Service:
- A
- A

**Notes:**

- RTOR: (a) 43%
### Traffic Volume Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>North Bound</th>
<th>South Bound</th>
<th>East Bound</th>
<th>West Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A) Existing</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) Project</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Geometrics

### Traffic Scenarios

**Scenario 1:** Existing (A)

**Scenario 2:** Existing + Project (A+B)

### Level of Service Calculations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Move-Ments</th>
<th># of Lanes</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Scenario Volumes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NBL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBT</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3200</td>
<td>515 515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>138 138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>93 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>63 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WBR (a)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>63 63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lost Time:**

|       | 0.13 | 0.10 |

**Intersection Capacity Utilization:**

|       | 0.42 | 0.43 |

**Level of Service:**

|       | A    | A    |

(a) 35% RTOR
## General Information
- **Analyst**: EB
- **Agency/Co.**: ATE
- **Date Performed**: 9/4/2007
- **Analysis Time Period**: AM PEAK HOUR
- **Intersection**: 04 AM EX
- **Jurisdiction**: SANTA BARBARA
- **Analysis Year**: EXISTING

## Volume Adjustments and Site Characteristics
### Approach
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>Eastbound</th>
<th>Westbound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume (veh/h)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Through Left Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Approach
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>Northbound</th>
<th>Southbound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume (veh/h)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Through Left Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Configuration
- **Eastbound**: L1 L2 L1 L2
- **Westbound**: L1 L2 L1 L2
- **Northbound**: L1 L2 L1 L2
- **Southbound**: L1 L2 L1 L2

- **PHF**: 1.00
- **Flow Rate (veh/h)**: 83 196 203 290
- **% Heavy Vehicles**: 4 4 4 4
- **No. Lanes**: 1 1 1 1
- **Geometry Group**: 1 1 1 1
- **Duration, T**: 0.25

## Saturation Headway Adjustment Worksheet
- **Prop. Left-Turns**: 0.1 0.2 0.1 0.1
- **Prop. Right-Turns**: 0.3 0.2 0.1 0.1
- **Prop. Heavy Vehicle**: 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0
- **hLT-adj**: 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2
- **hRT-adj**: -0.6 -0.6 -0.6 -0.6
- **hHV-adj**: 1.7 1.7 1.7 1.7
- **hadj, computed**: -0.1 -0.0 0.0 0.0

## Departure Headway and Service Time
- **hbd, initial value (s)**: 3.20 3.20 3.20 3.20
- **hbd, final value (s)**: 5.45 5.29 5.12 5.00
- **Mv-up time, m (s)**: 2.0 2.0 2.0 2.0
- **Service Time, t_s (s)**: 3.5 3.3 3.1 3.0

## Capacity and Level of Service
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity (veh/h)</th>
<th>Eastbound</th>
<th>Westbound</th>
<th>Northbound</th>
<th>Southbound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>10.24</td>
<td>10.42</td>
<td>10.18</td>
<td>11.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Delay (s/veh)**
- **OS**: A B B
- **Approach Delay (s/veh)**: 9.24 10.42 10.18 11.34
- **LOS**: A B B
- **Intersection Delay (s/veh)**: 10.58
- **Intersection LOS**: B

---
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## All-Way Stop Control Analysis

### General Information
- **Analyst:** EB
- **Agency/Co.:** ATE
- **Date Performed:** 9/4/2007
- **Analysis Time Period:** AM PEAK HOUR

### Site Information
- **Intersection:** 04 AM EX+PR
- **Jurisdiction:** SANTA BARBARA
- **Analysis Year:** EXISTING + PROJECT

### Volume Adjustments and Site Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>Eastbound</th>
<th>Westbound</th>
<th>Northbound</th>
<th>Southbound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L T</td>
<td>R L T</td>
<td>L T</td>
<td>R L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume (veh/h)</td>
<td>10 52 23</td>
<td>41 112 44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Thru Left Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>Northbound</th>
<th>Southbound</th>
<th>L T</th>
<th>R L T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L T</td>
<td>R L T</td>
<td>16 169 21</td>
<td>18 245 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume (veh/h)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Thru Left Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Configuration</th>
<th>Configuration</th>
<th>Configuration</th>
<th>Configuration</th>
<th>Configuration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1 L2</td>
<td>L1 L2</td>
<td>L1 L2</td>
<td>L1 L2</td>
<td>L1 L2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTR</td>
<td>LTR</td>
<td>LTR</td>
<td>LTR</td>
<td>LTR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHF 1.00</td>
<td>PHF 1.00</td>
<td>PHF 1.00</td>
<td>PHF 1.00</td>
<td>PHF 1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow Rate (veh/h)</td>
<td>85 197 206</td>
<td>290</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Heavy Vehicles</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Lanes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geometry Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration, T</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Saturation Headway Adjustment Worksheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prop. Left-Turns</th>
<th>Prop. Right-Turns</th>
<th>Prop. Heavy Vehicle</th>
<th>hL-T-adj</th>
<th>hRT-adj</th>
<th>hHV-adj</th>
<th>hadj, computed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Departure Headway and Service Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hd, initial value (s)</th>
<th>Hx, initial</th>
<th>Hx, initial</th>
<th>Move-up time, m (s)</th>
<th>Service Time, T</th>
<th>Capacity (veh/h)</th>
<th>Delay (s/veh)</th>
<th>LOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>9.27</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>10.47</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>11.39</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Capacity and Level of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity (veh/h)</th>
<th>Delay (s/veh)</th>
<th>LOS</th>
<th>Approach: Delay (s/veh)</th>
<th>LOS</th>
<th>Intersection Delay (s/veh)</th>
<th>Intersection LOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>335</td>
<td>9.27</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>9.27</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>10.63</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>447</td>
<td>10.47</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>10.47</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>456</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>10.26</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### General Information

- **Analyst**: EB
- **Agency/Co.**: ATE
- **Date Performed**: PM PEAK HOUR
- **Analysis Time Period**: 04 PM EX
- **Project ID**: 01167

### Site Information

- **Intersection**: SANTA BARBARA
- **Jurisdiction**: EXISTING
- **Analysis Year**: GARDEN STREET

### Volume Adjustments and Site Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>Volume (veh/h)</th>
<th>% Thru Left Lane</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastbound</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbound</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>Volume (veh/h)</th>
<th>% Thru Left Lane</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northbound</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southbound</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Configuration</th>
<th>Eastbound</th>
<th>Westbound</th>
<th>Northbound</th>
<th>Southbound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>L1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTR</td>
<td>LTR</td>
<td>LTR</td>
<td>LTR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHF</th>
<th>Flow Rate (veh/h)</th>
<th>% Heavy Vehicles</th>
<th>No. Lanes</th>
<th>Geometry Group</th>
<th>Duration, T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>391</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Saturation Headway Adjustment Worksheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prop. Left-Turns</th>
<th>Prop. Right-Turns</th>
<th>Prop. Heavy Vehicle</th>
<th>HLT-adj</th>
<th>HRT-adj</th>
<th>HHV-adj</th>
<th>hadj, computed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>-0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Departure Headway and Service Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>td, initial value (s)</th>
<th>x, initial</th>
<th>td, final value (s)</th>
<th>x, final value</th>
<th>Move-up time, m (s)</th>
<th>Service Time, ts (s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Capacity and Level of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity (veh/h)</th>
<th>Delay (s/veh)</th>
<th>LOS</th>
<th>Approach Delay (s/veh)</th>
<th>Intersection Delay (s/veh)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eastbound</td>
<td>Westbound</td>
<td>Northbound</td>
<td>Southbound</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>L1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>399</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>10.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.99</td>
<td>11.32</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>15.62</td>
<td>13.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes

- `HCS+™ Version 5.21` Generated: 9/6/2007 2:17 PM
- Copyright © 2005 University of Florida, All Rights Reserved
# ALL-WAY STOP CONTROL ANALYSIS

## General Information
- **Analyst:** EB
- **Agency/Co.:** ATE
- **Data Performed:** 2007
- **Analysis Time Period:** PM PEAK HOUR
- **Project ID:** 04167

## Site Information
- **Intersection:** 04 PM EX+PR
- **Jurisdiction:** SANTA BARBARA
- **Analysis Year:** EXISTING + PROJECT

## Volume Adjustments and Site Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>Eastbound</th>
<th>Westbound</th>
<th>Northbound</th>
<th>Southbound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume (veh/h)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%Thrus Left Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Northbound</td>
<td>Southbound</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume (veh/h)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%Thrus Left Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Configuration
- **L1** | **L2** | **L1** | **L2** | **L1** | **L2** |
- **Configuration:** LTR | LTR | LTR | LTR |
- **PHF:** 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
- **Flow Rate (veh/h):** 154 | 167 | 255 | 391 |
- **% Heavy Vehicles:** 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
- **No. Lanes:** 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
- **Geometry Group:** 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
- **Duration, T:** 0.25

## Saturation Headway Adjustment Worksheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prop. Left-Turns</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop. Right-Turns</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop. Heavy Vehicle</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTL-adj</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRT-adj</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HVV-adj</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hadj, computed</td>
<td>-0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Departure Headway and Service Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>t_0, initial (s)</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k, initial</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t_0, final value (s)</td>
<td>5.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k, final value</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move-up time, m (s)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Time, l_0 (s)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Capacity and Level of Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delay (s/veh)</td>
<td>Eastbound: 11.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>Eastbound: B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach: Delay (s/veh)</td>
<td>Eastbound: 11.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>Eastbound: B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Intersection Delay and LOS
- **Intersection Delay (s/veh):** 13.30
- **Intersection LOS:** B

---
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

An acoustical analysis report has been completed for a proposed mixed use project located at 800 Santa Barbara St., Santa Barbara, California. The purpose of this study is to document the noise environment and determine the necessary mitigation procedures for compliance with the relevant codes and standards. The structures must comply with the California Noise Insulation Standard (Title 24) as well as the City of Santa Barbara General Plan requirements.

Noise levels at the exterior and interior areas of the project due to future traffic conditions have been estimated and compared to the relevant standards.

The results of the analysis have shown that the resulting noise levels at the exterior of the structures as well as the interior spaces will be in compliance with all relevant codes and standards. The required mitigations are provided in the report.

The noise impact due to construction activities for the project on the Anacapa School, located on the north property line of the site is also discussed.
1. Introduction & Project Description

The proposed mixed use project is predominately a two story structure with a third story residential component in the northeast corner of the property. The commercial units are proposed on the first floor along the northerly property line; the residential units are located on the first and second floors. The parking spaces are provided in subterranean garage, shown in Figure 1. This parcel of land is bound by Santa Barbara Sr. on the west, east De la Guerra St. on the south, Anacapa School to the north and a private easement driveway to the east.

The major source of noise at and around this site is the traffic on Santa Barbara St. and to a lesser extent the traffic on De la Guerra St. The noises associated with the school are the activities in the school yard which occur during recess times and other outdoor functions. These are generally short term events which usually occur during daytime periods and only affect the north property line.

The north property line of the site is impacted by the traffic on Santa Barbara St and also the activities at the school. The levels at other property lines are primarily impacted by the local street traffic.

The existing traffic volumes along the 800 Santa Barbara Street block are 11,800 Average Daily Trips (ADT). The future 2030 volumes assume a growth factor of 6.7% resulting in a future traffic volume of 12,590 ADT’s. This growth factor was derived from the SBCAG 2030 Travel Forecast for Santa Barbara County report. The traffic on Santa Barbara St. primarily consists of car traffic with occasional medium size trucks. The speed range averages from 25 MPH to approximately 30 MPH. The traffic mix and speed averages were verified by site surveys and observations.

2. The Noise Criteria – Applicable Standards

The project must comply with California Noise Insulation Standards (Title 24) and UBC requirements. These standards require a maximum interior noise level of CNEL/Ldn 45 due to exterior noise sources. These requirements are also consistent with the City of Santa Barbara land use requirements. The City of Santa Barbara standard for exterior habitable land use is Ldn 60. The Ldn metric is a weighted average of hourly noise levels with increased values applied to nighttime periods.

The common floor ceiling assemblies and party walls within the structure must also comply with minimum noise impact and noise transmission requirements (IIC and STC ratings). The minimum ratings for these requirements are 50.

3. Noise Measurements

The existing noise levels at this site are primarily controlled by local traffic on Santa Barbara St. The future noise levels will also be controlled by the traffic on this street. The traffic on De la Guerra St. affects only the south property line and is insignificant as compared to the traffic on Santa Barbara St. traffic. The noise sources associated with the school affect the north property line only. These sources are due to school yard activities and are generally short term in nature.

A long term noise survey was performed at one location at the site. The long term survey was conducted at a point (shown as L in Figure 1) on the north property line of the site and is shown on Figure 1. This location was chosen to avoid contamination of data by the existing parking lot.
activities and also was close to both Santa Barbara St and school. The noise levels at this location are controlled by the Santa Barbara St. and activities in the school yard. School yard activities occur during day times and school days only. The measurements were performed during a typical school day. Hourly noise levels were measured and recorded for a 24 hour period. These levels are used to calculate the Ldn value. The Ldn values at other locations throughout the site may be estimated by using the result of this survey in conjunction with short term noise measurements and traffic noise calculations; Federal Highway Administration traffic noise modeling program (FHWA program) is used for this purpose.

The long term measurements started at 11:00am on Thursday February 22, 2007 and were completed 24 hours later at 11:00 on Friday. This period was a regular school day.

Short-term noise measurements (15 minute duration) were also performed at the site (shown as S1 to S6 in Figure 1) to determine the actual existing levels. Traffic noise is estimated using the Federal Highway Administration Traffic Noise Model with California vehicle noise emission parameters. This model uses traffic input data of volume, average speed and daily distribution.

The results of the long term survey are included in the Appendix. The results of short term measurements are included in Table 1.

4. Analysis

4.1 Exterior Noise Level Estimates

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) noise modeling program was used for estimating the noise levels due to traffic on the streets. The traffic volumes were obtained from the traffic engineer. The existing Average Daily Traffic (ADT) is 11,800 and will grow to 12,590 by the year 2030. The speed and traffic mix were obtained by actual field observations. The results of these calculations were in agreement with actual short term measurements (see note 2 in Table 1).

The noise environment at the site will be altered after completion of the project. This is due the attenuation and shielding effect of the proposed structures. The levels at the west property line will not be affected; however the levels at all other sides will be reduced. The estimated Ldn values at all property lines, after completion of the project and for future traffic conditions (year 2030) are included in Table 2. As it may be noticed the future levels at all location around the site will be below Ldn 60.

The proposed development must comply with the noise requirements as stated in the Noise Element which is part of the City of Santa Barbara General Plan. The requirements state that the interior noise levels must not exceed an Ldn value of 45 and exterior locations designated as private habitable areas must not exceed an Ldn of 60. These levels will be used as the basic acoustic design criteria for the project.

All outdoor living spaces for the units (designated as balconies and patios) will be below Ldn 60, as shown in Table 2, and therefore the project will be in compliance with exterior noise requirements of the standard.
4.2 Interior Noise Levels Estimates

As mentioned above the interior noise levels for residential units must be below Ldn 45. The estimated exterior noise levels as shown in Table 2 were used for calculating the interior noise levels. The analysis showed that if the doors and window afford a STC rating of 23 the interior noise levels will be below Ldn 45 level. It must be noted that most quality non-rated products yield STC rating of 23.

Additionally the common floor ceiling assemblies and party walls between residential units must afford IIC and STC ratings of 50. Typical construction details for these construction which comply with these requirements are included in the Appendix.

5. Construction Noise Levels

The construction phase of the project will involve activities which will generate short term noise levels. The detail of the construction program is not known at this point, however the following activities are anticipated:

- Demolition of existing structures
- Site grading
- Excavation, earth removal and shoring
- Foundation work
- Retaining wall construction
- Concrete works
- Structural framing
- Metal stud framing
- Exterior finish work
- Rough electrical, mechanical and plumbing
- Glazing
- Interior finish work
- Site work
- Paving
- Landscaping

The construction period starting with the demolition works through construction of retaining wall, have the potential for producing higher noise levels than the remaining construction activities.
The entire construction is planned to be completed within a 52 week period. The aforementioned activities, demolition through retaining wall construction which has the highest noise potential, are expected to be completed within the first five weeks of construction. A list of construction equipment and their noise levels are shown in the enclosed table in the Appendix.

There are no specific limits for construction noise in the City's regulation. In most jurisdictions the construction noise level is specified at 65 dBA for sensitive receptors such as schools, hospital, places of worship etc. Also construction activities are generally prohibited between 7:00pm to 7:00am daily. This prohibition also applies to Sundays and holidays.

Anacapa School is the most sensitive noise receptor during the construction period. The average noise levels are expected to range from 60 to 70 dBA at school yard during the first five weeks of construction. This estimate is based on the assumption that the noise emission levels from the equipment used are in compliance with the levels shown in the Appendix. These levels have the potential to interfere with normal school yard activities. In particular communication will be difficult under these conditions. In order to mitigate this impact it is recommended to use noise control blankets as noise barriers for specific equipment noise enclosures, if required and also as noise barrier along the property line between the school and the project site. The noise control curtain must have a minimum STC rating of 25.

The proposed mitigation measures for construction are expected to reduce noise to below 60 dBA levels. These levels are in the same order of magnitude as the general ambient conditions and therefore the impacts are considered to be insignificant.
Table 1
Results of Short Term Measurements at the Project Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Measured Noise Level, dBA (Note1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>62 (note 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S6</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

1. These are short term measured levels at the site.
2. At this location the levels were controlled by traffic on Santa Barbara Street only. The calculated level was 61.3 which is in close agreement with the measured level of 62. This analysis validates estimation of noise levels due to traffic using the FHWA noise modeling program.
Table 2

Estimated Ldn levels at the
Property Lines of the Site
(After completion of the project)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Line Location</th>
<th>Estimated Ldn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>56.6 (note 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>54.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>59.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

1. This level is due to both the traffic and school. The estimated level due to traffic is Ldn 52.0 and the noise due to school activities is at this location is Ldn 54.8 (the noise level due to traffic, without the building is, Ldn 55.0).
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Appendix
Long Term Noise Survey
Data Log
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Hour</th>
<th>Leq</th>
<th>Lmin</th>
<th>Lmax</th>
<th>L(1)</th>
<th>L(10)</th>
<th>L(25)</th>
<th>L(50)</th>
<th>L(90)</th>
<th>L(99)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02-22-07 Thursday</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Hour</th>
<th>Leq</th>
<th>Lmin</th>
<th>Lmax</th>
<th>L(1)</th>
<th>L(10)</th>
<th>L(25)</th>
<th>L(50)</th>
<th>L(90)</th>
<th>L(99)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02-23-07 Friday</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNEL 58.4 LDN 58.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNEL 58.4 LDN 58.1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Typical Party Wall and Floor-Ceiling Assemblies
NOTES

1. NO MECHANICAL TIES BETWEEN OPPOSITE SIDE OF PARTITION.
2. KEYHOLES FOR CONDUIT SHALL BE CUT IN WOOD STUDS IN SIDE SERVED.
3. WHERE SHEAR PANEL OCCURS, INSTALL TO STUDS UNDER GYP. BOARD AS REQUIRED BY STRUCTURAL. DO NOT INSTALL BETWEEN STUD ROWS.
4. TAPE OUTER JOINTS OF GYPSUM BOARD ONLY.
5. AT MULTIPLE LAYERS OF GYPSUM BOARD, STAGGER JOINTS. JOINTS AT STUDS ONLY. DO NOT GLUE LAYERS TOGETHER.

PARTITION DETAIL - TYPE P-5
NOTES

1. NO MECHANICAL TIES BETWEEN OPPOSITE SIDE OF PARTITION.
2. KEYHOLES FOR CONDUIT SHALL BE CUT IN WOOD STUDS IN SIDE SERVED.
3. ATTACH PLYWOOD TO STUDS UNDER GYP. BOARD AS REQUIRED BY STRUCTURAL.

ACOUSTICAL DESIGN INFORMATION ONLY

PARTITION DETAIL

VENEKLASEN ASSOCIATES
CONSULTANTS IN ACOUSTICS

E:\V\DIRE\ARCH\TENANT\P-5A 07-10-96 18:00
NOTES:

1. INSTALL MIN. 1/4" THICK PERIMETER ISOLATION MATERIAL AT PERIMETER OF CONCRETE POUR. SEE F-6G.
2. TAPE JOINT BETWEEN PERIMETER ISOLATION AND UNDERLAYMENT AND ALL UNDERLAYMENT SEAMS PER MANUFACTURER'S INSTRUCTIONS.
3. RESILIENT CHANNEL SHOULD BE "RC-DELUXE," 25 GA., BY DIETRICH. NO KNOWN EXCEPTIONS.
4. RESILIENT CHANNEL AND CEILING GYPSUM BOARD SHOULD BE HELD CLEAR OF WALL STRUCTURE, AND THE GAP CAULKED WITH ACOUSTICAL SEALANT. SEE F-6G.

DEMISING FLOOR/CEILING SYSTEM
## Noise Levels for Typical Construction Equipment Referenced to 50 Feet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Noise Level (dBA) at 50 Feet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact Equipment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth Moving</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compacters (Rollers)</td>
<td>70 - 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Loaders</td>
<td>72 - 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backhoes</td>
<td>72 - 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tractors</td>
<td>76 - 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scrapers, Graders</td>
<td>80 - 93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pavers</td>
<td>80 - 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trucks</td>
<td>82 - 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Mixers</td>
<td>75 - 87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Pumps</td>
<td>82 - 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranes (Moveable)</td>
<td>75 - 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cranes (Derrick)</td>
<td>85 - 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stationary</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pumps</td>
<td>68 - 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generators</td>
<td>70 - 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compressors</td>
<td>75 - 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pneumatic Wrenches</td>
<td>82 - 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Hammers and Rock Drills</td>
<td>90 - 97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pile Drivers (Peaks)</td>
<td>95 - 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Equipment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vibrator</td>
<td>68 - 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saws</td>
<td>72 - 82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>