CALL TO ORDER:
Chair George C. Myers called the meeting to order at 1:08 P.M.

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

Absent:
Charmaine Jacobs

STAFF PRESENT:
Jan Hubbell, Senior Planner
Danny Kato, Senior Planner
Jaime Limón, Senior Planner
N. Scott Vincent, Assistant City Attorney
Rob Dayton, Principal Transportation Planner
Steve Foley, Supervising Transportation Planner
Melissa Hetrick, Project Planner
Susan Reardon, Senior Planner
Roxanne Milazzo, Associate Planner
Kathleen Kennedy, Associate Planner
Stacey Wilson, Associate Transportation Planner
Chelsey Swanson, Associate Transportation Planner
Julie Rodriguez, Planning Commission Secretary

Before the commencement of the meeting, Chair Myers welcomed Danny Kato as Design Review Senior Planner.
I. PRELIMINARY MATTERS:

A. Requests for continuances, withdrawals, postponements, or addition of ex-agenda items.
   None.

B. Announcements and appeals.
   Mr. Kato announced that the appeal for 101 E. Victoria Street has been put on hold.

C. Comments from members of the public pertaining to items not on this agenda.
   Chair Myers opened the public hearing at 1:10 P.M. and, with no one wishing to speak, closed the hearing.

II. STAFF HEARING OFFICER APPEALS:

   ACTUAL TIME: 1:10 P.M.

A. APPEAL OF KURT MAGNESS ON BEHALF OF SMITH FAMILY TRUST ON THE ACTION BY THE STAFF HEARING OFFICER FOR 1420 ALAMEDA PADRE SERRA, APN _019-193-011, E-1 ONE-FAMILY RESIDENCE ZONE, GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: 3 UNITS PER ACRE (MST2006-00292)

   The project site is currently developed with a single-family residence and one-car garage. The proposed project involves conversion of the existing garage to habitable space and the construction of an attached two-car garage for the residence. The discretionary application required for this project is a Modification to permit a portion of the new garage to be located within the required ten-foot (10’) interior setback (SBMC§28.15.060).

   On July 2, 2008, the Staff Hearing Officer denied the request to permit any structure within the setback, and instead approved an uncovered parking space with landscaping for that area. This is an appeal of that decision.

   The Environmental Analyst has determined that the project is exempt from further environmental review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Guidelines Section 15301

   Case Planner: Roxanne Milazzo, Associate Planner
   Email: rmilazzo@SantaBarbaraCA.gov

   Roxanne Milazzo, Associate Planner, gave the Staff presentation.

   Susan Reardon, Staff Hearing Officer, concurred with the Staff presentation and remained available to answer any questions.

   Kurt Magness, Architect, gave the applicant presentation.
Mr. Magness clarified Planning Commission’s questions about the site plans and the relationship of the hedges to the property; clarification of the planter on the east edge of the property; met compliance in using the parking template for design of the parking swing-out radius; and remediation of drainage issues once a drainage plan is developed.

Staff responded to the Planning Commission’s question about the discrepancy over the existing and proposed garage square footage in the Staff Report; the covered parking allowed on the property as 750 s.f.; and compliance being met for not needing another modification. Also answered were questions about the consideration of locations for the uncovered parking space on the site; clarification of the neighbor’s swimming pool as only needing to be 5’ from the interior lot line; and consideration given to expansion of garage to the north towards the rear property for sufficient width for two cars as a possible conforming option.

Chair Myers opened the public hearing at 1:41 P.M. and, with no one wishing to speak, closed the hearing.

The Commissioners made the following comments:

1. One Commissioner noted the challenge in older lots meeting the parking requirements of newer vehicles. The alternative locations discussed are not sustainable and require greater excavation that what is proposed. In the absence of street parking, two Commissioners felt the proposal supportable and compatible with the neighborhood. Two Commissioners were in support of the appeal.

2. Safety exiting on Alameda Padre Serra is the greatest consideration for decision. One Commissioner felt that cars should exit with headlights first.

3. One Commissioner supports the Staff Hearing Officer’s decision but agreed with colleagues in favor of supporting the appeal, especially in light of one Commissioner’s suggestion of a sustainable option for expanding the garage to the north. Appreciates Historic Landmark Commission’s (HLC) identification of the project as a Structure of Merit. Remained concerned with the hedge not exceeding height and restricting views.

4. One Commissioner was unable to make the findings and could not support the appeal; was in full support of the SHO’s decision.

5. Two Commissioners found the request for a two car garage to be reasonable, appropriate for the lot size, and could also support the appeal.

6. One Commissioner was disappointed with the lack of landscaping and identified an area where a large planter could be placed. Also concerned with the sea of concrete at the mouth of the driveway’s width; suggested that ABR study the reduction of the concrete hard space. Another
Commissioner disagreed feeling that the amount of concrete was appropriate for the site.

7. One Commissioner felt that a two car garage is compatible with neighborhood and commented that the Riviera area is full of modifications.

**MOTION: Thompson/Bartlett**

Assigned Resolution No. 034-08

Upheld the appeal and directed the Architectural Board of Review (ABR) to reevaluate the plans for enhancing the landscaping and bringing the north boundary non-conforming hedge into compliance not to exceed the 8ft’ ordinance height maximum.

This motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 5  Noes: 1 (Jostes)  Abstain: 0  Absent: 1 (Jacobs)

Chair Myers announced the ten calendar day appeal period.

**ACTUAL TIME: 1:55 P.M.**

The following item was continued for redesign from July 10, 2008:

**B. APPEAL OF OROSZ ENGINEERING GROUP, INC., AGENT FOR PETER AND SYLVIA KURRELS, 810 BOND AVENUE AND 516 N. NOPAL STREET, APN 031-234-022, C-2, COMMERCIAL ZONE, GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: INDUSTRIAL (MST2004-00351)**

The denial of the proposed project by the Staff Hearing Officer on April 9, 2008 has been appealed by the property owner. The proposed project involves the conversion of an existing four-story, mixed-use development consisting of three apartments and one commercial unit to four condominium units on a 7,185 square foot lot. The residential units consist of one 601 square foot one-bedroom unit, one 1,137 square foot two-bedroom unit, and one 1,262 square foot three-bedroom unit for a total of 3,000 square feet. The commercial space is 3,171 square feet. Seven parking spaces (two covered and five uncovered) are provided. No exterior architectural alterations are proposed.

The discretionary applications required for this project are:

1. **Tentative Subdivision Map** for a one-lot subdivision to create three residential condominium units and one commercial condominium unit (SBMC§27.07); and

2. **Condominium Conversion Permit** to allow the conversion of three apartments and one commercial unit to four condominium units, including an exception to the parking standards. (SBMC§28.88).
The Environmental Analyst has determined that the project is exempt from further environmental review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines Section 15301 (Existing Facilities).

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

Kathleen Kennedy, Associate Planner, gave the Staff presentation.

Ms. Kennedy responded to the Planning Commission’s questions stating that the cobra head light fixture was permitted in 2004 and installed prior to the city’s streetlight guidelines being adopted. In response to the commercial onsite parking being met, Ms. Kennedy answered that Staff is recommending approval of the prior site plan with the angled parking with a recommendation that additional landscaping be required. According to the Zoning Ordinance, the required parking must be accommodated onsite, unless there is an off-site agreement. In this case, the parking requirement is being met onsite.

Steve Orosz, Orosz Engineering Group, Inc., gave the applicant presentation.

Mr. Orosz responded to Planning Commission’s questions stating that there is an on-street parking benefit that was created by applicant when one of the commercial driveways was removed and therefore, the applicant requests to participate in any future Residential Permit Parking Program (Condition #9); He explained the proposed on-site parking and commercial storage area and clarified the landscaping as being a 2’ strip with a trellis. He also responded that the slab could be cut to accommodate the proposed landscaping as long as the cuts were not at a diagonal.

Steve Foley, Supervising Transportation Supervisor, commented that the proposed parking plan, with access to one space from Nopal Street, has a number of problems, such as visibility and the potential to increase vehicle and pedestrian conflicts.

Peter Kurrells, Owner, addressed the Commission about the other property that he owns and the challenges he has had with the Quonset hut on the property. He stated that there is no legal address on the lot and it has only been used for storage.

Chair Myers opened the public hearing at 2:26 P.M. and, with no one wishing to speak, closed the hearing.

The Commissioners made the following comments:

1. Commissioners would have liked to have seen a picture of the other commercial lot owned by the applicant
2. One Commissioner could not support the new proposed plans because the overall design calls for the project to be aesthetically attractive, safe, and of
quality construction in a condominium conversion, and could not make the finding for the project being aesthetically attractive.

3. One Commissioner had hoped to see more landscaping and felt that the prior parking scheme that showed the angled parking was still achievable. Another Commissioner suggested enhanced landscaping along the perimeter of Nopal and Bond Streets.

4. Two Commissioners would like to revisit the prior project and see more greening. Commissioners would have liked to have seen more landscaping included in the presentation. One Commissioner could see a tree added between the angled storage and the two permanent designated spaces.

5. Two Commissioners would like to revisit the prior project and see more landscaping. Commissioners would have liked to have seen more landscaping included in the presentation. One Commissioner could see a tree added between the angled parking space and the two permanent designated spaces.

6. One Commissioner states that offsetting benefits are needed in order to make the findings to support the project.

7. One Commissioner would like to see the streetlight changed out, but not the post.

8. One Commissioner was satisfied with the onsite parking and agreed with the applicant for the waiver of the Residential Permit Parking Program. Some Commissioners could not support the parking permit elimination; want to see the project provide adequate parking without relying on permit parking on the street.

9. One Commissioner suggested finding a tree that did not have problematic roots to install near the slab. The mixed use aspect of the project presents a conundrum; would not like to see the storage space stacked with mechanical uses.

Staff provided the Commission with an aerial photograph showing the other property (518 N. Salsipuedes St.) owned by the applicant.

Mr. Orosz reviewed the applicant’s considerations for having utilized part of the area for commercial storage and not additional parking; asked for the ability to work with ABR to determine necessary landscaping to shield and green up area along the access ramp and the southerly wall that faces east/west.

Mr. Foley spoke to the relocation of the access space as not being possible due the requirement to be close to the building.

Mr. Kato added that four parking spaces are required, so a commercial storage space is not even a possibility.

Mr. Kato acknowledged the Commission’s struggle to act on limited information and informed the Commission that there was not a Permit Streamlining. Act
timeline. A continuance could be made to allow for more information to be provided.

**MOTION: Jostes/Larson**
Continued to September 18, 2008 for inclusion of a landscape plan prepared by a landscape architect that has significant green space of more than 5’ and includes species types and clarification of proposed storage space.

This motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 6  Noes: 0  Abstain: 0  Absent: 1 (Jacobs)

**III. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA**

A. Committee and Liaison Reports.
   1. Commissioner Myers reported on the Plan Santa Barbara subcommittee’s progress.
   2. Commissioner Larson attended the Historic Landmark Committee’s meeting and reported that the Hawkes Family Trust project on Predregosa Street is underway.

B. Review of the decisions of the Staff Hearing Officer in accordance with SBMC §28.92.026.
   None were requested.

C. Action on the review and consideration of the items listed in I.B.2. of this Agenda.
   b. Resolution 024-08
      1406 Grand Avenue
   c. Resolution 025-08
      211 Castillo/210 Wilson Avenue
   e. Resolution 026-08
      101 E. Victoria Street
   f. Resolution 027-08
      Draft Mission Canyon Community Plan

**MOTION: Jostes/Bartlett**
Approve the minutes and resolutions as corrected.
This motion carried by the following vote:
Ayes: 6 Noes: 0 Abstain: As noted. Absent: 1 (Jacobs)

Commissioners Bartlett, Jostes, and Myers abstained from the minutes of July 10, 2008 pertaining to the La Entrada de Santa Barbara project.
Commissioner Jacobs abstained from the minutes of July 10, 2008 pertaining to 101 E. Victoria Street
Commissioner Jacobs abstained from resolution #026-08
Commissioner Larson abstained from the minutes of July 10, 2008 pertaining to the Mission Canyon Community Plan.
Commissioner Larson abstained from resolution #027-08

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Prior to adjourning, Commissioner Jostes acknowledged and recapped the contributions made by outgoing Senior Planner Jan Hubbell, who is retiring after 30 years of service to the city, and the legacy she leaves behind.

Ms. Hubbell responded by sharing her collective memories in having been part of a full-service staff serving a population of over 90,000 and appreciation for the comments made.

Chair Myers adjourned the meeting at 3:02 P.M.

Submitted by,

Julie Rodriguez, Planning Commission Secretary
APPEAL OF KURT MAGNESS ON BEHALF OF SMITH FAMILY TRUST ON THE ACTION BY THE STAFF HEARING OFFICER FOR 1420 ALAMEDA PADRE SERRA, APN 019-193-011, E-1 ONE-FAMILY RESIDENCE ZONE, GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: 3 UNITS PER ACRE (MST2006-00292)

The project site is currently developed with a single-family residence and one-car garage. The proposed project involves conversion of the existing garage to habitable space and the construction of an attached two-car garage for the residence. The discretionary application required for this project is a Modification to permit a portion of the new garage to be located within the required ten-foot (10’) interior setback (SBMC§28.15.060).

On July 2, 2008, the Staff Hearing Officer denied the request to permit any structure within the setback, and instead approved an uncovered parking space with landscaping for that area. This is an appeal of that decision.

The Environmental Analyst has determined that the project is exempt from further environmental review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Guidelines Section 15301

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has held the required public hearing on the above application, and the Applicant was present.

WHEREAS, no one appeared to speak in favor of the application, and no one appeared to speak in opposition thereto, and the following exhibits were presented for the record:

1. Staff Report with Attachments, August 28, 2008
2. Site Plans
3. Correspondence received in support of the project:
   a. Eugene C. Johansen, Santa Barbara
4. Correspondence received in opposition to the project:
   a. Paula Westbury, Santa Barbara

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the City Planning Commission:

Upheld the appeal, denying the decision of the Staff Hearing Officer, unable to make the finding that a Modification to permit the garage to be located within the interior setback was necessary to secure an appropriate improvement and does not meet the purpose and intent of the ordinance, because conforming parking options exist with the following conditions:
1. The project return to the Architectural Board of Review (ABR) to reevaluate the plans for enhancing the landscaping; and

2. The applicant brings the north boundary non-conforming hedge into compliance not to exceed the 8’ ordinance height maximum.

This motion was passed and adopted on the 4th day of September, 2008 by the Planning Commission of the city of Santa Barbara, by the following vote:

AYES: 5  NOES: 1 (Jostes)  ABSTAIN: 0  ABSENT: 1 (Jacobs)

I hereby certify that this Resolution correctly reflects the action taken by the city of Santa Barbara Planning Commission at its meeting of the above date.

Julie Rodriguez, Planning Commission Secretary  Date

THIS ACTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION CAN BE APPEALED TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITHIN TEN (10) DAYS AFTER THE DATE THE ACTION WAS TAKEN BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION.