DATE: March 30, 2010

TO: Planning Commission
Architectural Board of Review (ABR)

FROM: Bettie Weiss, City Planner

SUBJECT: Discussion of Draft Architectural Guidelines and Development Standards Proposed by the Coast Village Road Business Association (CVBA).

Two discussions are to be held for the purpose of enhanced dialogue with the Architectural Board of Review (ABR), Planning Commission, and the CVBA for its vision of this area of the community. No action will be taken. The ABR will hold a discussion on Monday, April 5, and the Planning Commission on Thursday, April 8, 2010.

Draft Guidelines and Standards
The CVBA sponsored two Town Hall meetings in May 2008 and later that year, together with architect Tom Bollay, drafted a set of Architectural Guidelines and Development Standards. City Staff reviewed the draft and suggested that it be submitted as public comment into the PlanSB General Plan Update, and this was done at a Council meeting in December 2008. Please review attached documents.

This discussion is the first time that the Planning Commission and ABR, will discuss the proposed guidelines and standards. The CVBA would like the City to formally review and adopt a special set of guidelines and standards for the Coast Village Road area based on the outcomes of the PlanSB and this draft. Staff anticipates that during the implementation phase of PlanSB the proposal will be considered along with many other matters. Staff has advised the CVBA that priority and schedule decisions for PlanSB will be difficult due to limited resources and the process necessary for adopting such documents. In particular, there are two elements of the draft proposal, a Floor to Lot Area Ratio (FAR) of 0.60 and a 2 story height limit, would require a Zoning Ordinance Amendment approval by the Council and a Local Coastal Plan Amendment by the California Coastal Commission in order to be implemented. Members of the community are continued and encouraged to fully participate in projects reviews; some of the suggested guideline language, i.e. the eleven goals provide good general direction, and guidelines are very similar to other city official guidelines.
Coordinated City & County Review Process
Another effort, encouraged by the City Council and County First District Supervisor Salud Carbajal, to improve communication with residents and businesses in the area has resulted in new a coordinated planning review process. Staff from the City and County met together with representatives of the Montecito Planning Commission, Montecito Board of Architectural Review, the Montecito Association and CVBA to consider a formal method to enhance public input on major projects in the Coast Village Road area. The attached memo and process explains how staff will make early contacts, provide notice, and assist at a hearing with the Montecito Planning Commission prior to bringing a project to the City Planning Commission for action. We also anticipate asking for a City Planning Commission representative to attend the hearing as well. There have been some preliminary discussions with a few property owners on Coast Village Road, including the shopping center adjacent to Vons and the Chevron station. We expect that applications will be filed at some point in the future and staff will use the new coordinated review process.

Exhibits:
A. Coast Village Road “Semi-Rural Commercial Overlay District”
B. Coordinated City & County Review Process
Coast Village Business Association
Proposed Coast Village Road
“Semi-Rural Commercial Overlay District”

Executive Summary
10/25/2008

Preservation of what is now known as the “Eastern Gateway to Santa Barbara” has a long history of community involvement and support. In 1930, John Jameson rallied the community and committed substantial personal funds to create the Montecito Parkway, the first of its kind in California. The purpose of the parkway which initially stretched from Olive Mill road to San Ysidro Road, was to limit roadside commercial development along the Coast Highway to a few short blocks in order to preserve the rural “village” character of Montecito. Again, when the modern Highway 101 bypassed Coast Village Road, local citizens approached the City of Santa Barbara and through annexation to the city again took significant steps to preserve our cherished semi-rural “village” character, reducing the road from four lanes to two with broad landscaped medians. Since then this Eastern Gateway has become an important tourism, residential and neighborhood commercial resource for Santa Barbara and Montecito.

For the past two and one half years, the Coast Village Business Association (CVBA) has been working with local property and business owners to develop a vision plan for the future of Coast Village Road and Circle. It became clear to CVBA that development pressures similar to those occurring on the Chapala Street corridor would soon become the undoing of our cherished semi-rural road. CVBA began discussions in February of 2006 and drafted a vision plan for Coast Village.

It is not the policy or the goal of CVBA to approve or disapprove specific projects, rather to provide comment with regard to compatibility with the knowledge and long history of community input to the benefit of our community at large. CVBA sought direction regarding how to formalize a land use overlay or ordinance for Coast Village Road and Circle that serves to protect and enhance the ambiance and theme of an upscale small town that defines this area while retaining the attraction to visitors who come to this destination for the lifestyle it exudes. In that vein, Coast Village Business Association has met with Mayor Marty Blum, Senior City of Santa Barbara Planners Bettie Weiss and Jaime Limon. We have also had the valuable assistance of City Councilman Grant House.

In part due to the recommendation by Santa Barbara City Councilman House, CVBA sponsored two Town Halls in May 2008 in order to initially facilitate the expression of issues pertaining to Coast Village Road and Circle, and then to develop ideas for solutions. Members of the community representing property owners, businesses and residents were invited. Key City and community personnel were also invited as resources and availability of services. They were members of the Community Development
Department, Santa Barbara Police Department, the Mayor and our City liaison Nina Johnson, the City Civil Engineer, other City Planners and County Supervisor Salud Carbajal. Their experience and input was very valuable in assisting in the direction of all of this information into a semblance of order.

We are grateful for the City’s support by their attendance and participation. From the results of the forums, we have compiled the essential points pertaining to Traffic, Pedestrian, Environmental, and Building issues that were identified and discussed in depth. Many of the issues dealing with repair and maintenance of infrastructure and how the Village can be more “green,” were revealed in the Town Halls. CVBA has identified a checklist of items to be handled as maintenance priorities by the City and the County. The main points of the Forums are in the proposed Coast Village Guidelines.

Included in this packet are: 1) The Town Hall 1 Issues, 2) The Town Hall 2 Results: Ideas and Solutions and 3) CVBA’s revised Guidelines from August 2006—now called Proposed Coast Village Road “Semi-Rural Commercial Overlay District,” mainly focused on how the building development and renovation issues as well as parking, views, traffic and pedestrian needs may be incorporated into Santa Barbara’s Plan Santa Barbara and New General Plan as an “overlay” or “district.”

The purpose of the above Guidelines is to assist the property owner, business owner, architect, developer and builder in designing projects that will be harmonious with the existing character of Coast Village’s “Semi-Rural Commercial Overlay District.” These Architectural Guidelines and Development Standards also serve as a guide for the Planning Commission and Architectural Board of Review (and possibly the Historic Land Commission) and City Staff in the design review process.

The goals of these guidelines is to ensure that all development will carefully consider the community context in which it takes place and have a compatible relationship to neighboring properties and community as a whole.

To preserve and enhance Coast Village’s unique setting the “Commercial Overlay District” shall include the following restrictions:

A Maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) for CVR’s commercially Zoned properties whether proposed for development with commercial, mixed use or residential uses shall not exceed a FAR of 60% of Net Lot Area.

Development on all commercially zoned properties in “Coast Village” shall not exceed a maximum height of 2 stories and 30’. Daylight Basements shall not count as a story South of the centerline of Coast Village Road Proper.
Coast Village Business Association

Proposed

Coast Village Road
“Semi-Rural Commercial Overlay District”

Architectural Guidelines and Development Standards

10/14/08
Proposed CVR
Semi-Rural Commercial Overlay District
Architectural Guidelines and Development Standards

Background

Coast Village Road, “Eastern gateway to Santa Barbara” was once known as The Coast Highway. Bypassed by modern US 101 in the mid 50’s, Coast Village Road (CVR) serves as both a residential and neighborhood commercial area for Santa Barbara and Montecito. CVR was redeveloped from its former roadside commercial four-lane highway configuration into a landscaped two-lane neighborhood commercial area by the City of Santa Barbara in the 1960’s. Its character then and now is made up primarily of one and two story buildings of Cottage, 1920’s Spanish Colonial and other roadside vernacular architectural styles.
Proposed CVR
Semi-Rural Commercial Overlay District
Architectural Guidelines and Development Standards

Current Setting

Current Zoning allows buildings of 3 stories and 45' in height. Required setbacks are typically 10' along the road with no requirements on the side and rear property lines except where residentially zoned property abuts the commercially zoned parcel.

Setback well from the road the most prominent building as you approach CVR from the East is the Montecito Inn. Built by Charlie Chaplin in the 1920’s it is a classic Spanish Colonial style hotel of the era. Although more massive than would be considered appropriate today its historic significance makes it apart of the ambiance of the road.

Several large-scale condominiums were built on CVR in the 60’s and 70’s. Though set well back from the road these four story developments seem out of scale and do not contribute to the pedestrian feel of the road. With the exception of the condominium developments referenced above, CVR retains the architecturally quaint neighborhood feel much admired by the surrounding community and its business owners alike. CVR most closely resembles the Upper Montecito Village, which with its strict zoning restrictions has successfully been able to maintain its “residential” scale.

Purpose

The purpose of this document is to assist the property owner, business owner, architect, developer and builder in designing projects that will be harmonious with the existing character of CVR’s “Semi-Rural Commercial Overlay District”. These Architectural Guidelines and Development standards also serve as a guide for the Planning Commission (PC), Architectural Board of Review (ABR) and city staff in the design review process. These design guidelines are not meant to discourage unique or innovative design solutions. Rather, they embody the intent of the findings that must be made for design review applications and serve as the basis on which decision- makers bodies make their decisions in addition to the Zoning Ordinance requirements.
Goals

The goals of these guidelines is to ensure that all development will carefully consider the community context in which it takes place and have a compatible relationship to neighboring properties.

The following goals shall guide the planning, design and approval of all new and remodeled structures, all replacement structures and all structural additions:

1. To preserve, protect and enhance the existing semi-rural environment of Coast Village Road.
2. To encourage high standards in architectural and landscape design.
3. To ensure neighborhood compatibility of all projects.
4. To encourage a variety of architectural styles.
5. To respect public mountain and ocean views.
6. To protect solar access to the road and neighboring properties.
7. To preserve the semi-rural feel of the road by restricting the use of traffic signals.
8. To protect the beauty and ecological balance of Montecito’s and Santa Barbara’s natural resources.
9. To respect existing mature trees and landscape.
10. To ensure present and future diversity of businesses and building/land purposes.
11. To ensure planning which is orderly, functionally efficient, healthful, aesthetically-pleasing and convenient to the public, business and residential neighbors as well as the community as a whole.
Neighborhood compatibility

Generally, proposed developments should demonstrate compatibility on two different levels:

- The development should be compatible with immediately adjacent developments; and
- The development should be compatible with the character of the surrounding neighborhood.

There are several planning elements that critically affect whether a proposed development is perceived to be compatible with its surroundings, as follows:

- The physical characteristics of adjacent structures (e.g., architectural style, materials, colors, size, bulk, scale, height, setbacks, building orientation, and landscaping);
- Existing views of the site from public areas;
- Existing natural features on the site; and
- Existing pedestrian and vehicular circulation through or adjacent to the site.

In general, a successful project design will enhance, rather than remove or detract from, the above elements.
The new development in this illustration (center, bold) has been planned to enhance and expand an existing open space. The site arrangement has also provided an opportunity for a paseo between an interior parking lot and street frontage.
Size Bulk and Scale

To preserve and enhance CVR’s unique setting the “Commercial Overlay District” shall including the following restrictions:

A Maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR) for CVR’s commercially zoned properties whether proposed for development with commercial, mixed use or residential uses shall not exceed a FAR of 60% of Net Lot Area.

Development on all commercially zoned properties on CVR shall not exceed a maximum height of 2 stories and 30'. Daylight Basements shall not count as a story South of the centerline of Coast Village Road Proper.

Definitions:

Lot Area, Net:       Net Lot Area is the total area of the parcel or parcels proposed for development excluding Public / Private road / alley ROW.

Floor Area:        Floor Area is defined as the total area of all floors / stories of a building as measured to the interior surface of the exterior
walls (24" maximum), and including covered parking open or otherwise, all shafts, corridors, stairs enclosures, and including covered balconies/loggias enclosed on two or more sides, but excluding Basements and (Daylight Basements used exclusively for parking South of CVR proper).

Basement: A floor/story partly or wholly below grade. A basement shall be counted as a story and included in the FAR calculations if one-third of its height is above the average level of the adjoining natural/existing grade.

Daylight Basement: A Basement with direct access to adjacent grade on one or more sides.

To better emulate current residential scale of the neighborhood a maximum floor-to-floor height of 14' from ground finish floor level to the second finish floor.
To further promote pedestrian scale of the road, courtyards and *paseos* should be encouraged at sidewalk grade.

**Parking**

Parking has become scarce on the road proper, therefore each new development shall be required to provide its full parking requirement on site.
1. Below grade parking is to be encouraged.
2. Design automobile parking facilities to reduce the visibility of automobiles and allow features of greater pedestrian interest to dominate the streetscape.
3. At grade covered parking shall not abut the road and all parking shall be screened from public view.
4. Locate parking structures behind habitable buildings and towards the interior of the parcels.

**Pedestrian, ADA, Safe Crosswalks**

Pedestrian safety and access is of great importance to the semi-rural feel of the road, success of its businesses, and safety of its residents and visitors.

1. Sidewalks should include ADA curb cuts where appropriate, typically at road intersections and crosswalks.
2. Sidewalks should be of appropriate width and provide for an opportunity for landscaping. This may require that new development / retaining walls be further setback.
3. In cooperation with the adjacent residential neighborhoods to the North of CVR, unpaved walking paths of an appropriate width are desired to provide safe pedestrian access to the Road.
4. Crosswalks shall be designed to clearly confer the right of way to the pedestrian and minimize the crossing distance.
5. Encourage the development of mid-block crosswalks in area with high pedestrian volumes.
6. Pedestrian amenities should include seating opportunities (e.g. benches, raised planters, low walls, or sculptured stairs). Seating should be located where it will not interrupt the flow of pedestrians. Outdoor dining facilities shall also be located where they do not interrupt the flow of pedestrian traffic.
7. Place trash cans, drinking fountains, newspaper vending machines, telephones or other pedestrian amenities in areas where they will not interrupt the flow of pedestrian traffic.

8. Design of new pedestrian amenities to complement the architectural style of existing amenities and surrounding buildings while not overpowering the streetscape.

9. Provide improved Transit stops in existing locations. Provide seating, route maps and covered canopies where possible.

Environment and Aesthetics

1. Provide pedestrian-scale lighting that compliments the surrounding built and natural environment. When determining the proper level of illumination for street or pedestrian areas, it's important to consider the quality of light versus the quantity of light. The lighting should be subtle and avoid over lighting while being bright enough to provide a sense of security. Consider a variety of lighting types, including foot-lighting, indirect lighting (wall washing), and hooded overhead lamps. All lighting fixtures shall conform to the City's Outdoor Lighting Design Guidelines. Characteristic Streetscapes

Residential Scale and Characteristic Streetscapes

Residential scale buildings and characteristic streetscapes to be emulated on Coast Village Road are the Monterey colonial revival building - Paseo El Camino at 1290 CVR, the Moody Sisters commercial building at 1086 CVR, The old Haywards Home building at 1101 CVR, and shops and offices at 1145 and 1155 CVR.
Other examples of pedestrian scale Santa Barbara commercial developments that exemplify the scale of this district are, the old El Paseo on East Del la Guerra and Anacapa Streets; Meridian Studios and Lugo Adobe at 114 East De La Guerra Street; Medical Office building on 1513-1515 State Street, Santa Barbara City fire station #3, 415 East Sola Street; Santa Barbara Historical society Museum, 136 East Del; La Guerra.
RESULTS of
TOWN HALL 1 (May 8, 2008)

TRAFFIC/PARKING

1. “Dumping” of cars on Coast Village Circle (6)*
   +Construction workers -
2. Too many cars (3)
3. Against closing of South Bound on ramp (3)
4. Employees and contractors parking in residential areas (3)
5. Should not have a parking garage on the ground level. Shops instead.
6. Round a bout will it help with traffic?
   +Might be too difficult to maneuver
   +No round a bout at Middle Road
   + Should Olive Mill round a bout be built before new development?
7. Should Coast Village Circle be one-way? –more user friendly
8. Stop sign at Butterfly?-dangerous intersections. People stop anyway.
9. Signals would be a detriment to the village feel
10. More decorative signs and lamp posts

Ideas & SOLUTIONS:

a. Put up a parking structure or create a parking district (3)
b. More meter maid control
c. Bring back the electric shuttle ! (5)
   + connect Lower with Upper Village
d. Zoning especially for Coast Village with parking controls or overlays (3)
   + Mixed use overlay. Shops with residential above
e. An employee or resident sticker system of Coast Village Circle and lower residential areas
f. The Portland Model= integrated transportation modes:
   (ped, bike, train, bus)

* NUMBER OF DISCUSSION GROUPS THAT BROUGHT UP THIS ISSUE
RESULTS OF TOWN HALL 1

PEDESTRIAN/ADA/Residential Impact/Flavor

1. Medians/ambiance
   + No grass in the medians
   + Remove median
   + Should be more heavily landscaped - Carmelesque
   + Landscaping of islands (medial strips) needs to be better
   (5)*

2. Concern about Crosswalks !!
   + dangerous
   + need more crosswalks
   + problems crossing @ Butterfly Rd
   + need flashing lights for crosswalks

3. Not enough Wheelchair cuts (3)

4. Sidewalks
   + make wider (3)
   + Buckling, narrow sidewalks; sometimes chairs from outdoor
     restaurant encroach making it difficult to traverse
   + Make brick
   + Tunnel needs maintenance. People don’t know it exists
   + Extend sidewalks up into residential area
   + Extend sidewalks to Coast Village Circle
   + Improve sidewalks - make continuous along entire road

Ideas & SOLUTIONS

a. Active warning systems for crosswalks (3)
b. Should be attractive lampposts
c. Mixed use
d. Decorative lamp posts

* NUMBER OF DISCUSSION GROUPS WHO VOICED THIS ISSUE
RESULTS of TOWN HALL 1

ENVIRONMENT

1. Freeway noise, danger along Coast Village Circle
2. More diverse and Carmel-esque retail desired
3. LIGHTING. (6+) *
   + Should be hooded, softer
   + Too much light affecting residential area
   + Lighting from City to County needs better integration
4. Bridge rail on Olive Mill from Coast Village Rd to Biltmore TOO LOW and DANGEROUS—many pedestrians cross this bridge
5. Air: worry about traffic congestion from construction along CV Rd
6. Vistas, solar, breezes, semi-rural atmosphere in danger of extinction without some planned protection
7. What to do about **potential limitation of water** for added improvements to a renovation or new development on CVRd or CVCircle.
   + Is there other source of water available?

Ideas & SOLUTIONS

a. Sound Walls on CV Circle

* DISCUSSION GROUPS THAT VOICED THIS ISSUE
RESULTS OF TOWN HALL 1

BUILDINGS: HEIGHT BULK & SCALE

1. Height.
   + Two (2) stories should be the new norm along the road (6)*
   + Two stories from street level max.
   + Three stories even if set back from road is too high
   + Stay lower stay smaller
   + Variation in height – topography of buildings should be like a
     bobby pin-varied (4)
   + Constant flow in height and look
   + No tall buildings, especially at entrances to the road
   + Don't want canyonization

2. Scale: solar/views
   + Mixed Use: ground level shops, real estate, other businesses
     and residential on upper floors
   + Buildings should not block solar access (4)
   + Buildings shouldn't block public vistas (6) mountain side
     important, ocean side less important
   + No public vistas on CVRd.

3. Scale: FAR (floor area ratio to land area of parcel)
   + leave it at .25 right now. Don’t go with anything more than
     what we have!
   + FAR should vary

4. CVR has a strong economy BECAUSE OF ITS SMALL-TOWN FEEL
   Do not change the ambiance.
   + Spanish architecture is desired.

Ideas & SOLUTIONS:

a. More Paseos linking buildings and courtyards
b. 1920s look, like Montecito Inns, is good
   c. Keep the style of buildings eclectic (3) (diverse architecture)

* DISCUSSION GROUPS THAT VOICED THIS ISSUE
RESULTS OF TOWN HALL 1

MISCELLANEOUS

1. Need better communication between City and County.
2. Coast Village Rd and Circle should be part of County
3. People in the County feel left out and not a part of
decisions that affect the City surroundings
4. What is the City's minimum responsibility to repair,
maintain, upgrade Coast Village Rd, Circle? Work
together with a NOW laundry list and a vision for the
future.

Ideas & SOLUTIONS:
Coast Village Business Association

RESULTS OF TOWN HALL 2
May 28, 2008.
IDEAS & SOLUTIONS

The following are ideas and solutions to issues that were identified pertaining to Coast Village (Road and Circle including City limits) in Town Hall 1 May 8, 2008.

TRAFFIC & PARKING

1. To the construction worker parking problem, issue 2-hour parking permits for employees.

2. In a development agreement with the City or County, make proper parking of workers a condition of approval.

3. To many at the roundtables, parking is not a problem, but residents say there is: consumers and employees are parking up, along residential streets. Again, a type of 2 hour permit for residents/guests could be a solution.

4. Most want to save the parking side of the medium but stop the “cut-thru” traffic and slow the speed down.

5. New development should provide sufficient parking for employees and real estate agents.

6. The rules about on street parking should be modified to not fulfill a building parking requirement.

7. The 101 Widening & Round a Bout construction could have adverse effect on Coast Village Rd. A committee should be formed to watch dog this project.

PEDESTRIAN, ADA, SAFE CROSSWALKS

1. A detail of pedestrian walkway goals should be drawn to include more ADA curbs, a flow of the whole Road and Circle, including meeting residential areas to city borders. Most would rather see a walking path into residential areas. Brick sidewalks are suggested for Cy Rd.

2. Although the bridge on Olive Mill to Channel Drive is County, the rail is rusted and dangerously low for pedestrians, especially children.

3. Crosswalks need attention, better warnings, attractive signs.

4. What we have derived from the second TOWN HALL is a desire for a flow of crosswalks, paved sidewalks—a better pedestrian feel—throughout
courtyards and along paseos, along Coast Village Road and including Coast Village Circle. Better lighting and landscaping is valued for the boulevard and Circle.

ENVIRONMENT/AESTHETICS:

1. No one was interested in a sound wall for CV Circle. A solution to curb noise and freeway visibility could be a thick hedge along the ugly chain link fence.

2. To the water issue: Conservation is key; non potable irrigation/possible from Montecito Country Club. Implement during Hot Springs’ construction. But equity is also key. Commercial needs must be met for minimum standards and new development as approved. With Montecito Water attempting to conserve, the City should work out a mutual agreement with MWD whereby MWD provides full allotment to CVRd and balance from City if necessary. Land use and pedestrian enjoyment of the village should not be impaired.

3. Character of the street to be preserved.

4. Trees hugely important

5. More benches - park like


BUILDING HEIGHT BULK & SCALE

1. Low, small unobtrusive buildings are preferred. Three stories okay as long as only 2 stories from the CVR level and designed as below.

2. FAR (floor area ratio) is a second concern; there should be no exceptions to zoning, parking first concern.

3. There should be more public space in buildings (courtyards, fountains)

4. Style should be mixed use. This was almost unanimously mentioned.

5. The look can be different architectural styles but should serve the community. Our completed guidelines should encourage quality architecture with important language that any architect understands.

6. One solution to defining good architecture for the road is the FLOOR AREA RATIO. In the Upper Village, Montecito Association’s Ordinance requires no more than a 25% of land area use of building. Coast Village should consider a limit of no more than double that amount. On grade
parking should be considered as part of floor area ratio, thus encouraging underground parking. (R-4 parking should be underground).

7 We have found at our two Town Halls that the businesses, property owners and residents want to see up to two story mixed use buildings, preferably with retail or commercial use on the ground floor and office/residential on the second. An exception to the 2nd floor could be if on the south side of Coast Village Road and on the Circle, there could be allowed a "daylight basement" of more than 50% grade of the perimeter of the building below. This could be aptly construed to mean a third story but under those conditions a 3rd story workable. Parking underground is preferred.

8 In our guidelines, we will use several books as references of good and appropriate architecture for Coast Village.

If you read snippets from the Montecito Journal or just talk to people who are a) retailers and b) shoppers—there is a great appreciation for what we have and to keep it this way. What we propose is just that with the character of quality design and guidelines describing same with room for enhancement.

9 At Town Hall Bill Pallidini said Montecito wants land use control and the City wants revenue. Coast Village Rd and Circle should achieve preservation, infrastructure enhancement and the ability to improve and rebuild old structures with good solid guidelines made a part of an official design district.

These Town Hall 2 Results will be incorporated with any appropriate results from Town Hall 1 into a Coast Village Business Association set of design guidelines for the City of Santa Barbara Plan Santa Barbara and General Plan.
TO: Santa Barbara City Council  
Santa Barbara City Planning Commission  
Santa Barbara County Board of Supervisors  
Montecito Planning Commission

FROM: Paul Casey, Santa Barbara City Community Development Director  
Glenn Russell, Santa Barbara County Planning and Development Director

DATE: January 29, 2010

RE: Coordinated City and County Review Process  
Coast Village Road Projects

City and County Planning staff have worked together to formalize a coordinated review process for projects located along Coast Village Road. Staff also met with members of the Montecito Planning Commission, Board of Architectural Review and Montecito Association to discuss this proposed process. This process is in the best interest of the residents of the area, both City and County. It provides a familiar forum for residents in Montecito, including the Montecito Association representatives, to provide their input to the City. It also provides a formal structure to obtain comments from the Montecito Planning Commission and Board of Architectural Review members. The standards for review for projects located on Coast Village Road remain the City adopted codes and policies. While they are similar to the County codes and policies for the Montecito community, they differ in some respects. The key planning issues of neighborhood compatibility and environmental consequences are shared between the jurisdictions.

The attached documents the review process in some detail. The City and County staff are committed to implementing this process immediately, as projects warrant, and periodically reviewing the process and modifying it as appropriate based upon experience with the process.

Please feel free to contact either Bettie Weiss, City Planner, City of Santa Barbara at 564-5509 or Dianne Black, Director of Development Services, County of Santa Barbara at 568-2086 with any questions or comments on this review process.
Coast Village Road Projects
Coordinated City & County Review Process
January 2010

Area Covered: Coast Village Road and Coast Village Circle

Threshold: Projects that require City Planning Commission approval, or projects that are heard by the City Staff Hearing Officer and are appealed to City PC.

Review: Montecito Planning Commission review, including presentation by City staff, including analysis to date, public comment, and input from the Montecito Planning Commission. Montecito Board of Architectural Review (MBAR) members will be invited to the meeting. All information gathered during the review will be forwarded to the City Planning Commission and included in written staff reports.

City staff will request that 1 to 3 of the City Planning Commissioners attend the Montecito PC meeting.

Timing: Review should occur early in the process – either after a project has been deemed complete, or after the draft environmental document has been prepared. Decision on timing will be made jointly by City and County planning staff.

Noticing: County Staff for the Montecito PC and the Montecito Association will request to be listed as interested parties for parcels in the area. The City will then send noticing of any hearing scheduled before City Architectural Board of Review, Historic Landmarks Commission, and/or City Planning Commission that require noticing.

Noticing of Montecito Planning Commission hearing will need to be determined case-by-case, however, it will include the City’s standard noticing procedures, i.e. property owners within 300 ft, residents within 100 feet, and interested parties).

Agreement: This agreement will be in writing and implemented administratively immediately.