

DRAFT

City of Santa Barbara

Planning Division

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

September 25, 2008

CALL TO ORDER:

Chair George C. Myers called the meeting to order at 1:30 P.M.

ROLL CALL:

Present:

Chair George C. Myers

Vice-Chair Stella Larson

Commissioners Bruce Bartlett, Charmaine Jacobs, John Jostes, Addison S. Thompson and Harwood A. White, Jr.

STAFF PRESENT:

Bettie Weiss, City Planner

John Ledbetter, Principal Planner

Danny Kato, Senior Planner

N. Scott Vincent, Assistant City Attorney

Rob Dayton, Principal Transportation Planner

Bill Ferguson, Water Resources Supervisor

Steve Foley, Supervising Transportation Planner

Barbara Shelton, Project Planner/Environmental Analyst

Peggy Burbank, Project Planner

Irma Unzueta, Project Planner

Beatrice Gularte, Project Planner

Julie Rodriguez, Planning Commission Secretary

I. PRELIMINARY MATTERS:

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

Chair Myers opened the public hearing at 1:30 P.M. and, with no one wishing to speak, closed the hearing.

II. DISCUSSION ITEM:

ACTUAL TIME: 1:31 P.M.

**PLAN SANTA BARBARA (PLANSB) GENERAL PLAN FRAMEWORK: DRAFT
POLICY PREFERENCES**

- A. **Staff Presentation** – Staff will provide an overview of the draft general plan framework and recommended policies and alternatives as well as expected outcome of Phase III of the *PlanSB* process. *Completed September 10, 2008.*
- B. **Comments from Board and Committee Members** – Board and Committee members who have been active in *PlanSB* will have an opportunity to provide input on policy considerations relevant to their charge.
Completed September 10, 2008.
- C. **Public Hearing** – It is expected that a significant part of the first meeting date, Wednesday, September 10, will be to receive input from the community. This will be an opportunity for organizations and the general public to provide input on all the policy issues. *Hearing held on September 10, 2008.*
- D. **Planning Commission Discussion and Recommendation on:**
1. General Plan Framework
 2. Draft Policy Preferences Document (Exhibit A)
 - a. Sustainability Framework
 - b. General Plan Elements
 - i. Land Use and Growth Management
 - ii. Economy and Fiscal Health
 - iii. Environmental Resources
 - iv. Housing
 - v. Community Design and Historic Resources
 - vi. Circulation
 - vii. Public Services and Safety*Initial discussion held September 10 and 11, 2008.*
 3. Alternatives to be included in the EIR
 4. Confirm components and direction of the upcoming *PlanSB* Phase III activities
 5. Choose Representatives to attend and work with Ordinance Committee on the *PlanSB* Interim Zoning and Design Ordinance.
Commissioners Bruce Bartlett and Charmaine Jacobs were appointed on September 18, 2008.

Email: jledbetter@SantaBarbaraCA.gov; bshelton@SantaBarbaraCA.gov

John Ledbetter, Principal Planner, gave the Staff presentation with updates on where the meeting left off from September 11, 2008, and was joined by Barbara Shelton, Environmental Analyst.

Scott Vincent, Assistant City Attorney, provided an update on the Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA) compliance challenges with the Housing Element and listed six criteria that must be met. Land Use Policy LG2, as written, can pass some of the criteria, but presents potential issues with others. Stated that combining LG2 with LG1 could meet more of the criteria for compliance with the State's Housing and Community Development (HCD) requirements.

Staff answered Planning Commission questions about defining a resource, such as limited sewer capacity, school, water or transportation; limiting housing growth based on not being able to make the findings caused by resource constraints; and the difficulty in getting an extension from the HCD in order to develop and adopt the Land Use element prior the Housing element.

Commissioner's comments:

1. One Commissioner recalled a prior request made in January for the identification of resource limitations and build-out, and comments made in April prioritizing housing ahead of commercial.
2. Remained concerned that city will have to increase sewage treatment capacity, change transportation thresholds, and develop new water resources in order to meet the RHNA allocation number.
3. One Commissioner wanted to make sure that measurable resources were considered when addressing the RHNA allocation.
4. One Commissioner reminded the Commission that the matrix for housing and non-residential component looks at the number of units irrespective of unit sizes.
5. Measure E has worked on regulating commercial development. Residential growth management could be looked at with similar limitations.
6. Encouraged Staff to look at the Camden Report used by Cottage Hospital.
7. One Commissioner asked Staff for clarification on whether the desalination plant counted as a dependable water supply or just as backup.
8. Commissioners asked if the EIR will take into consideration the economic vitality of the community and if the revenue factor will be considered when square footage is increased/decreased.

Staff responded that the EIR process will assist in defining the project before defining the process. Resource constraints will be identified during the process.

Mr. Vincent responded to the Commission's questions about exploring remaining options to address the RHNA appeal for reallocation of numbers and stated that SBCAG is moving

forward with submitting the final allocation to the Department of Housing and Community Development. He also read passages from the “Building Blocks for Effective Housing Elements” that addressed government constraints and land use controls.

Staff commented on the residential matrix and studying dual density, a range of density incentives for affordable housing and changing variable density standards based on square footage. Staff also stated that resource use and growth will be explored in the EIR. Unit sizes will be considered in square footage, as well as economics.

Bill Ferguson, Water Resources Supervisor, provided an update on the desalination plant and the State water project; the water supply plan; and the water budget.

Barbara Shelton, Environmental Analyst, gave the Staff presentation on the preliminary EIR project and alternatives, followed by Mr. Ledbetter, who covered the *PlanSB* Phase III activities.

Chair Myers opened the public hearing at 2:57 P.M.

Connie Hannah, League of Women Voters (LWV), commented on supporting much of the proposed General Plan policies but remains concerned about living within our resource while managing growth. Also concerned with the State overwhelming local planning with RHNA allocation.

With no one else wishing to speak, the public hearing was closed at 3:02 P.M.

Staff answered additional Planning Commission questions about the EIR’s intent to look at a range of alternative policies by focusing on all the input from the workshops. Responded to an inquiry of the page 2 chart of non-residential development assumptions regarding the amount of Measure E square footage. Staff stated that the minor additions figure was based on average yearly historic growth; demolition reconstruction figure came from historic and potential build-out; and the Sphere of Influence number came from the annexation policy update that was done a few years ago.

Staff also responded to the Commission’s questions about resolving the discrepancy between the project description looking at 2020 and 2030 by waiting for the outcome in decisions over LG1 and LG2; correcting imbalances in residential growth while addressing the RHNA allocations required over various time periods; and explained how the Commission’s suggestions were reflected in the alternative policy scenarios. Staff also discussed the policies considered in the EIR Policy Alternatives and stated that more work was needed in fleshing out policy alternatives to evaluate. A solution was offered in showing LG2 and planning for additional growth of 2,000 dwelling units for the year 2020 and allowing up to 4, 500 added dwelling units if interim monitoring demonstrates adequate resources and community conditions.

One Commissioner clarified his intentions with both LG1 and LG2 in trying to establish a ceiling on non-residential growth and a floor on residential growth based upon available resources. He also asked for trigger points to evaluate what has been done and tying them to RHNA numbers. Another Commissioner stated that one primary aspect of this project is looking at our current resources, so a checkpoint is needed far before receiving the next RHNA number.

Mr. Vincent responded to Ms. Weiss comments regarding RHNA allocations and resource limitations by stating that the language accommodates RHNA. He responded to the Commission's question on the next steps by identifying them as: 1) a new recognition on the part of the city that both non-residential and residential uses require our resources; 2) incorporate adaptive management tools that look at the build-out as it occurs and addresses the build-out as it begins to use up finite resources; and 3) when the threshold of resources are reached, there is some limitation on the development of residential housing.

As the threshold for resources are met, one Commissioner suggested looking at commercial as the first relief valve before shutting off the residential. Another Commissioner looked at varied calculations in trying to balance the relationship between commercial square feet and dwelling units.

Ms. Weiss responded to one Commissioner's concern about the economic vitality of the community and having a sustainable economy as part of the General Plan by stating that several policies in the existing Land Use Element came out of the last General Plan Update. Ms. Shelton added that the EIR focus is on physical environmental impacts; a separate consultant study will focus on economic issues and is intended to work concurrently with the EIR to address economic issues.

STRAW POLL:

Agree that LG becomes three parts: A) Policy on use of the limited resources in favor of residential over non-residential units; B) Non-residential program of 1.5 million with specific findings; and C) Housing broken into two segments of a) the period of 2009-2020, and b) the period of 2020-2030, accommodating the total HCD/RHNA requirements.

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

Commissioner's Larson and White have never supported RHNA numbers and feel that it is an inappropriate use of State power; hope that the RHNA number could be reduced. Ms. Larson prefers to look at something that offers more simplicity in the policy alternatives. Ms. Jacobs feels that the RHNA should not drive our general plan; can accommodate, but not drive it.

One Commissioner asked that the discussion take into consideration the suggestions made by the Santa Barbara Regional Chamber of Commerce addressing commercial needs.

Commissioner Larson stated that the EIR should include and define community priorities and community benefits; changed her straw vote to a 'No'. Commissioner Jacobs also

changed her vote from a 'Aye' to an 'No' vote; believes the city needs to accommodate the RHNA requirements, but the General Plan should not need to state the exact number of units.

REVISED STRAW POLL:

Agree that LG becomes three parts: A) Policy on use of the limited resources in favor of residential over non-residential units; B) Non-residential program of 1.5 million with specific findings; and C) Housing broken into two segments of a) the period of 2009-2020, and b) the period of 2020-2030, accommodating the total HCD/RHNA requirements.

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

Mr. Vincent clarified confusion over the chart and LG2. The no project alternative was meant to indicate keeping existing policies and meets the RHNA. The introduction of a residential number limitation in the policy alternatives is what challenges RHNA.

Commissioner Thompson stated that while he agreed with Commissioner White, a protest vote against the State would not accomplish anything.

Ms. Weiss reviewed the non-residential development assumptions and how the 1 million square feet figure equated to 400,000 square feet for a 20 year period over what has been on the books for pending projects, some that may expire. One Commissioner added that the commission still had discretion over approval of the 400,000 that was pending.

The Commission grappled with the quandary of addressing RHNA numbers, preservation of Measure E square footage, planning for future development, and defining the EIR scope of analysis. One Commissioner was perplexed with the bi-product of saleable development credits that have resulted from the current policy that has allowed for the density transfer rights of residual commercial space when replaced by a mixed-use project. Another Commissioner was concerned that increases in commercial square footage would result in increases to RHNA numbers. One Commissioner added that there is an economic hit to the city if only residential units are annexed due to the cost of services for residential being higher than for commercial; commercial generates income. Staff assisted the Commission in isolating considerations to be made.

The consensus of the Commission was to develop a new policy to eliminate the reallocation of non-used, non-residential square footage transfer of development rights (TEDR's).

Phase III Work Program Tasks:

It was suggested that the Planning Commission Subcommittee review the changes made and recommendations to City Council. However, one Commissioner felt that the Commission was not ready to move forward given the absence of maps and more detail; did not want to delegate to the subcommittee with comments.

Commissioner Jostes read aloud and submitted two objectives for Land Use and Growth Management.

The Commission remained concerned with where they are in the process, but acknowledged that they are 99% there. One Commissioner added that with the Upper State Street Study, a model process had been developed that showed where policies would be applied. The *PlanSB* process has discussed hot zones (Downtown, Milpas, De la Vina, Funk Zone, Coast Village Road, the Mesa, etc.) and wondered why we do not yet have maps. Staff responded that maps were prepared in the Development Trends Report. A Land Use Map update will be forthcoming.

Commissioner's comments:

1. The consensus of the Commission felt that the full Commission's should review any changes and the diagrams accompanying the policy report before comments go to City Council and to ensure that the Commission's comments are clear. Does not feel that it is ready for City Council.
2. Two Commissioners felt that we need to move forward so that we can begin the EIR and that it will provide many of the answers that the Commission is grappling with. Two Commissioners remained concerned over moving onto an EIR without having a clear project definition and also in not having maps done for the community hot spots.
3. One Commissioner felt the Land Use Element and the Map need to be done at a point in the process that it will have an effect on the product. One Commissioner felt that Flood Control Maps and MODA need to be included.
4. One Commissioner acknowledged the evolution that has occurred with the Policies Preference Document. Most Commissioners felt that sufficient time had been spent on the document and that they were ready to move on to the next step.
5. One Commissioner liked the objectives presented by Commissioner Jostes but felt that they are more appropriate for the Adaptive Management Program.
6. One Commissioner suggested that the Upper State Street Study should serve as a model for the other hot spot areas. Another Commissioner voiced concern for not having more neighborhood participation from the hot spot areas.

Ms. Weiss stated that State Street Study's level of work resources were not available for all the hot spots; Upper State Street Study utilized five staff and a consultant and took over a year. The General Land Use Map will be developed next year, but not as detailed as the Upper State Street Study.

MOTION: Bartlett/Jacobs

Continue meeting to the next available date in November.

This motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 6 Noes: 0 Abstain: 0 Absent: 0

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Myers adjourned the meeting at 5:35 P.M.

Submitted by,

Julie Rodriguez, Planning Commission Secretary

DRAFT

DRAFT

City of Santa Barbara

Planning Division

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

October 9, 2008

CALL TO ORDER:

Chair George C. Myers called the meeting to order at 1:06 P.M.

ROLL CALL:

Present:

Chair George C. Myers

Vice-Chair Stella Larson

Commissioners Bruce Bartlett, Charmaine Jacobs, Addison S. Thompson and Harwood A. White, Jr.

Absent:

Commissioner John Jostes

STAFF PRESENT:

Danny Kato, Senior Planner

N. Scott Vincent, Assistant City Attorney

Allison De Busk, Project Planner

Chelsey Swanson, Associate Transportation Planner

Julie Rodriguez, Planning Commission Secretary

I. PRELIMINARY MATTERS:

- A. Requests for continuances, withdrawals, postponements, or addition of ex-agenda items.

None.

- B. Announcements and appeals.

Mr. Kato made the following announcements:

1. The appeal of the Planning Commission's decision on 800 Santa Barbara Street was heard by City Council on Tuesday. No Planning Commissioner attended and communication improvements were discussed to avoid a similar situation in the future.

2. The Planning Commission meeting of October 2, 2008 was cancelled last week, but a Special Meeting of the City Council and Planning Commission was held yesterday to review the Planning workload and priorities.
 3. Reviewed the items scheduled to be heard on October 16, 2008 and announced that 124 Los Aguajes will be continued indefinitely.
 4. A Joint meeting of Planning Commission and Transportation and Circulation Committee (PC/TCC) will be held on October 16, 2008 at 6 P.M. in the David Gebhard Public Meeting Room. Commissioners Larson and Bartlett requested the Staff Attorney to look into any potential conflict and possible need to step down.
 5. Reviewed the Planning Commissioner's calendar for the remainder of the year. Commissioner Jacobs announced that she will need to abstain from the 101 E. Victoria Street project to be heard on November 20th due to the applicant's attorney belonging to the same firm as her husband.
- C. Comments from members of the public pertaining to items not on this agenda.
- Chair Myers opened the public hearing at 1:15 P.M. and, with no one wishing to speak, closed the hearing.

II. **CONCEPT REVIEW:**

ACTUAL TIME: 1:15 P.M.

Ex Parte Communication:

Commissioners Jacobs and Myers communicated with the applicant shortly after the initial concept review was held where the project went from 22 units to a more residential model. Commissioner Jacobs previewed the project, only in concept, and not the drawings currently presented.

APPLICATION OF LISA PLOWMAN, AGENT FOR SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA-NEVADA CONFERENCE – UNITED CHURCH OF CHRIST, 230 LIGHTHOUSE ROAD, APN: 045-021-021, E-3/S-D-3 ONE FAMILY RESIDENCE/COASTAL OVERLAY ZONES, GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: RESIDENTIAL, 5 UNITS PER ACRE (MST2006-00455)

The proposed project consists of a ten-lot residential subdivision. Three of the lots (Lots 8, 9 and 10) would be designated "affordable" lots, potentially developed by Habitat for Humanity. Two private driveways (one at the northern boundary and one at the southern boundary) are proposed to provide vehicular access to all of the lots. A common walkway would be provided down the center of the site to provide pedestrian access to each of the lots. Lot sizes would range from approximately 2,760 to 5,300 square feet for the affordable lots, and approximately 8,555 to 10,600 square feet for the remaining seven lots. Eight lot frontage modifications would be required for the project as a whole. The following modifications would be required for the three affordable lots: lot area, interior setbacks,

parking, and open yard area. The project does not include construction of the individual homes. The existing church and all existing site improvements are proposed to be demolished. The purpose of the concept review is to allow the Planning Commission and the public an opportunity to review the proposed project design at a conceptual level and provide the Applicant and Staff with feedback and direction regarding the proposed land use and design. The opinions of the Planning Commission may change or there may be ordinance or policy changes that could affect the project that would result in requests for project design changes. **No formal action on the development proposal will be taken at the concept review, nor will any determination be made regarding environmental review of the proposed project.**

The discretionary applications required for this project are:

1. Tentative Subdivision Map (TSM) for a ten-lot subdivision (SBMC Chapters 27.07);
2. Three (3) Lot Area Modifications to allow three over-density units (bonus density) on a lot in the E-3/S-D-3 Zone (SBMC §28.92.110, A, 2);
3. Four (4) Interior Yard Setback Modifications to reduce the required six-foot interior setbacks on proposed Lot 8, Lot 9 (2) and Lot 10 to zero feet (SBMC §28.92110, A, 2);
4. Three (3) Parking Modifications to reduce the required parking for proposed Lots 8, 9 and 10 to one covered space (SBMC §28.92110, A, 1);
5. Three (3) Open Yard Area Modifications to reduce the size and dimensions of the required open yard areas for Lots 8, 9 and 10 to 15 feet x 15 feet (SBMC §28.92110, A, 2);
6. Eight (8) Street Frontage Modifications to allow eight of the lots to have less than 60 feet of frontage on a public street (SBMC §28.92110, A, 2);
7. Two (2) Public Street Frontage Waivers to allow more than two lots to be served by a private driveway (SBMC §22.60.300);
8. Coastal Development Permit to allow development in the non-appealable jurisdiction of the Coastal Zone (SBMC §28.44.060); and
9. Design Review Approval by the Single Family Design Board (SFDB) (SBMC, Chapter 22.69).

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

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

Staff answered Planning Commission questions about the logistics for providing affordable land versus affordable units by stating that Habitat for Humanity would take responsibility for the affordable land and has submitted a letter of interest in the project. Mr. Vincent added clarification on the Inclusionary Housing Ordinance's conditions and the covenant that would likely be established. While Habitat for Humanity has expressed interest, the

covenant would restrict selling the lots at more than an affordable rate and would apply to anyone buying the lots.

Staff answered additional Planning Commission questions by stating that an inclusionary housing plan would be submitted by the applicant as part of their project and it would contain details on whether the market-rate lots would be built while the affordable lots remained vacant; clarified the minimum parcel size for the zone district as 7,500 square feet net; confirmed that the Planning Commission could require units built as part of the subdivision map; and elaborated on granny units. Mr. Vincent added that the inclusionary housing ordinance applies to single family homes and condominium units of real property that can be transferred separate and apart from other units; granny units are secondary units and would not fall into the ordinance.

Lisa Plowman, Peikert Group Architects gave the applicant presentation and introduced Gary Roberts, United Church of Christ.

Ms. Plowman and Mr. Piekert addressed the Planning Commission's questions about logistics about the building and sale of the units by stating that the sale would involve the sale of lots and not the units and therefore they wouldn't have control over the timing of unit construction. She noted that the walk-street would be approximately a 16-foot wide easement that would run up the center of the lots and would be for communal use. She responded to Washington School's concern about parking and the space available to each lot by illustrating the guest spaces that would be available. Affordable units would have a single garage and ownership would be restricted to households with only one car via an annual review and subject to fines for non-compliance. Ms. Plowman also spoke to the varied lot configurations studied and stated that the configurations presented required fewer modifications, and the majority of modifications are related to the affordable units. She noted that attached units are cheaper to build. If the four-unit configuration were pursued with a loft unit over the garage, there are ways to mitigate the close proximity of the second story to the school, such as conditions on windows and landscaping. The applicant would continue to work with the school for mitigation.

Staff clarified that if the affordable units were developed as condominiums, they would go to the Architectural Board of Review, whereas if developed as attached single-family homes on individual lots, they would go to the Single Family Design Board.

Chair Myers opened the public hearing at 2:01 P.M.

The following people spoke in support of the project:

1. Ed Gamble would be supportive of the plan if it were to be built, but feels that this concept is just establishing a sales price for the property.
2. Joyce McCullough, Executive Director, Habitat for Humanity, looks favorably to working with the applicant in providing affordable housing; commented on the challenge in finding affordable property in the city. Habitat for Humanity is very

interested but does not have a formal agreement in place; they're waiting to hear the direction given by the Planning Commission.

The following people spoke in opposition to, or with concerns about, the project:

1. Dr. Walter Dukes, neighboring development owner, feels that Lighthouse Road is a very narrow road and remains concerned with how parking will be provided for all residents when street parking is very restricted. Would like to see story poles used to show impact to neighbors and potential blockage of ocean views.
2. Nica Guinn, adjacent neighbor, was concerned with the proposed height and impact on privacy.

With no one else wishing to speak, the public hearing was closed at 2:09 P.M.

Staff answered additional Planning Commission questions about drainage in the area by stating that a draining report was submitted for the project and it was consistent with the City's adopted Storm Water Management Practices.

The Commissioners made the following comments:

1. One Commissioner liked the pedestrian orientation. Did not think splitting the driveway was the most efficient layout for maximizing land use, but appreciated the buffer it provided for the school. Not convinced that small lots are the best way to proceed, especially with zero lot lines; it would effectively create an R-3 zone that may not be appropriate for the neighborhood. A homeowners association (HOA) with mixed uses and income levels could produce problems for future owners of the single family units.
2. Some Commissioners were concerned with fire access to the rear of the units and adequate turnaround for the trucks. Concerned with the distance to rear units from closest fire hydrant. Staff confirmed that the Fire Department had reviewed the project and felt the access was adequate. They did not intend to use the driveways for access and could access the units through alternative ways.
3. Commissioners were concerned with the limited parking that appears to have potential neighborhood impacts, including traffic impacts. Poor traffic ingress and egress. Difficult to enforce parking limitations on low income units; leaves enforcement to the HOA and could result in enforcement issues. Commissioners would like to see parking addressed for the affordable units.
4. No guarantee that the project won't be changed in the future since the objective of the proposal is to sell the lots. Two Commissioners were in favor of conditioning the Map to lock in conditions. One Commissioner would like to see the project committed to the concept presented, not seeing something different come forward for approval.
5. Some Commissioners were concerned with the change in plans from what was included in the Commission's packet and what was shown in the applicant's Powerpoint presentation, and feel that a continuance may be in order. Would like to see more adequate drawings submitted. Concerned that there may not be as much open space as is depicted in the renderings.

6. Public benefit of affordable housing should not be at the expense of the neighborhood. Lots of modifications asked for this project. Affordable housing should be similar to market rate units, not separately distinguished. Some Commissioners were concerned with the integration of affordable units to the project and neighborhood compatibility issues.
7. One Commissioner felt that there could be a configuration designed with market rate units and rental units, such as granny units.
8. Some Commissioners loved the concept of the walkable area, but have reservation that the width of 16' is too narrow and this may not be the best place for it. Some Commissioners noted that the scale of the houses seems too big for the layout. This would not really look like a bungalow development. Two Commissioners would like to see the project "breathe".
9. The neighbor in unit number 5 would lose privacy with the zero lot line.
10. Cannot buy off on having all the affordable units up front with limited parking that would end up impacting the street.
11. One Commissioner could see reducing the area of the three oversized market rate lots by 8' in width, allowing for more room for the affordable units and less setback modifications needed. Would also provide additional width allowing for one more parking stall for each affordable unit and would eliminate the need for 3 parking modifications.
12. Concerned with implementation of association dues and CC&Rs that work for the affordable units and market rate units.
13. Would like to see well-defined building envelopes that would guarantee the walk-street and people plaza areas and show how the buildings will be placed and relate to each other.
14. Each of the 7 market rate units could have a granny unit on their own lot. Suggested widening the affordable lots. Could support the public street waiver.
15. One Commissioner could not support granny unit approach. One Commissioner favored the four unit approach if it could be done with reasonableness in association with the school and meeting the parking needs. One Commissioner could see rezoning the lot to bring affordability to the area.

Regarding whether granny units could be built on the lot, Mr. Vincent clarified that in single family zones, granny units were possible but there are limitations. For this project, you might not get the maximum number of lots using the minimum zoning requirement and still get granny units, but could perhaps have less lots and satisfy the granny unit requirements. Mr. Kato added clarification of the requirements for secondary granny units and stated that it would be possible, but not for 8 lots.

Mr. Peikert responded to the Commission's comments by stating that the alternative was a 7-8 unit subdivision with a large cul-de-sac that would not be a superior design for this project. Assured the Commission and the public that this is a concept review and not a request for a final approval. When the project returns, building envelopes, open space, easements, etc. will be defined. With regard to parking, was agreeable to working on the addition of more guest spaces. Asked for more clarification on the affordable units and

support for the walk-street design concept. Asked for the Commission's preferred option of the two presented.

Commission asked for continued neighborhood cooperation. Recalled past situations where rear units were made to have sprinklers to address Fire safety issues. One Commissioner did not want to have to choose between the two options presented at the concept level and risk hampering the applicant's creativity.

Mr. Peikert asked for Commission's clarification on desire to have affordable units. One Commissioner stated that due to the constraints of the neighborhood, this lot may not be the place to put in affordable units.

Some Commissioners noted that this project is trying to be many things to many people: single-family, multi-family, combined single- and multi-family development all in an E-3 zone; a single family zone. Would prefer to see what is more compatible to the existing single-family neighborhood. Granny units could address the question of affordability by presenting rental units and be managed by the lot owners, whereas rental units would have different management.

Many Commissioners felt that having affordable units was not the best way to go and an attempt to force-feed the affordable units into the project. Looks like trying to build a multi-family building in a single-family neighborhood but calling it single-family homes. Project could result in having two homeowners associations and their associated challenges caused by force-feeding this concept. Neither of the concepts presented are the best approach given the constraints of the site. With regard to affordable units, one Commissioner suggested an alternative of going to two units instead of three. Two Commissioners suggested 8-9 single-family market rate units, keeping the walk-street concept and forgoing the affordable units. Otherwise, if affordable units are kept, two Commissioners suggested spreading them out and eliminating the setback requirements. One commissioner remained concerned with granny units. Most Commissioners felt that the three unit approach was better than the four unit approach.

Mr. Kato asked the Commission to consider the possibility of the affordable units being split up and mixed with the other units, instead of the triplex presented. One Commissioner made an observation about Granny units being added and concerns with the setbacks, parking and access, and wondered if the units could just be developed with guest quarters that could be used as a rental option. We are not in a position to advocate granny units or not.

Ms. Plowman reminded the commission that 8 Granny units would bring more parking issues than having three affordable housing units.

III. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

A. Committee and Liaison Reports.

1. Commissioner Thompson reported on the Transportation and Circulation Committee and recapped the discussion on traffic ballot measures. Reminded the Commission about the upcoming Joint Planning Commission and Transportation and Circulation Committee meeting on October 16, 2008.
2. Commissioner Myers reported on missing recent Downtown Parking Committee meetings and the Committee's concern for PlanSB. The Downtown Parking Association will be submitting its thoughts and focus on PlanSB.

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

Commissioner White reported on the Staff Hearing Officer meeting held on October 8, 2008 where three modifications were granted and 2 time extensions.

C. Action on the review and consideration of the following Draft Minutes and Resolutions:

- a. Draft Minutes of September 4, 2008
- b. Resolution 034-06
1420 Alameda Padre Serra

MOTION: Thompson/Larson Approve the minutes and resolutions of September 4, 2008 as edited.

This motion carried by the following vote:

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

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Myers adjourned the meeting at 3:14 P.M.

Submitted by,

Julie Rodriguez, Planning Commission Secretary