



City of Santa Barbara Planning Division

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

August 11, 2011

CALL TO ORDER:

Chair Jostes called the meeting to order at 1:00 P.M.

I. ROLL CALL

Chair Sheila Lodge, Commissioners Bruce Bartlett, Charmaine Jacobs, Mike Jordan, Stella Larson, and Deborah L. Schwartz.

Absent: Commissioner John Jostes

STAFF PRESENT:

Allison De Busk, Project Planner
N. Scott Vincent, Assistant City Attorney
Chelsey Swanson, Associate Transportation Planner
Kelly Brodison, Assistant Planner
Suzanne Riegle, Assistant Planner
Julie Rodriguez, Planning Commission Secretary

II. PRELIMINARY MATTERS:

- A. Action on the review of the following Draft Minutes and Resolutions:
1. Draft Minutes of July 7, 2011
 2. Resolution 013-11
1547 Shoreline Drive
 3. Draft Minutes of July 14, 2011
 4. Resolution 014-11
917 Paseo Ferrelo Road
 5. Resolution 015-11
2547 Medcliff Road

MOTION: Larson/Jordan

Approve the minutes and resolutions as corrected.

This motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 6 Noes: 0 Abstain: as noted. Absent: 1 (Jostes)

Commissioner Jacobs abstained from the Minutes and Resolutions of July 7, 2011.

- B. Requests for continuances, withdrawals, postponements, or addition of ex-agenda items.
None.
- C. Announcements and appeals.
None.
- D. Comments from members of the public pertaining to items not on this agenda.
Chair Jostes opened the public hearing at 1:04 P.M. and, with no one wishing to speak, closed the hearing.

III. NEW ITEM:

ACTUAL TIME: 1:05 P.M.

EX PARTE COMMUNICATION:

Commissioner Schwartz disclosed an ex parte communication with Nancy Leffert, President, Antioch University, regarding a private tour of the facility.

APPLICATION OF TRISH ALLEN, SUZANNE ELLEDGE PLANNING AND PERMITTING SERVICES, AGENT FOR THE HUTTON FOUNDATION, 602 ANACAPA STREET, APN 031-151-017, C-M (COMMERCIAL MANUFACTURING) ZONE, GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: GENERAL OFFICE/MAJOR PUBLIC INSTITUTIONAL (MST2011-00145)

The project consists of a proposal to construct a 3,626 square foot (sf) addition, completely within the existing first floor volume of an existing mixed-use building, to create classrooms and offices for Antioch University. In order to meet Antioch's deadline for classes in September 2011, the project was split into three phases, to allow for construction of improvements as soon as building permits could be issued. Phase 1 is being processed under BLD2011-00501 for an interior tenant improvement that does not require discretionary review. Phase 2 is being processed under MST2011-00105, and includes the demolition of a 1,691 square foot mezzanine, and construction of a 2,646 sf new second floor completely within the existing ground floor volume. Phase 2 will use the remaining 955 sf balance from the Small Addition category. Phase 2 requires Development Plan Approval (DPA) by the Architectural Board of Review. Phase 3 includes an additional 980 sf of second floor area, and retains the 1,691 square foot

mezzanine. Phase 3 would require DPA by the Planning Commission (PC) for cumulative non-residential additions exceeding 3,000 sf. The City Council approved a preliminary Community Priority allocation of 2,671 sf on May 17, 2011. If the timing allows, the applicant will eliminate the second phase, and proceed directly to PC for DPA for 3,626 sf of floor area (2,671 sf Community Priority + 955 sf Small Addition = 3,626 sf) prior to ABR approval of the architectural changes.

The discretionary applications required for this project are:

1. Design Review approval by the Architectural Board of Review.
2. A Development Plan to allow the construction of 3,626 square feet of nonresidential development (SBMC §28.87.300); and
3. A Final Community Priority Designation by City Council(SBMC§28.87.300)

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

Case Planner: Suzanne Riegle, Assistant Planner
Email: SRiegle@SantaBarbaraCA.gov

Phone: 805-564-5470, ext. 2687

Suzanne Riegle, Assistant Planner, gave the Staff presentation and presented the Commission with revised findings. Chelsey Swanson, Associate Transportation Planner was also available to answer any questions.

Nancy Leffert, President, Antioch University, gave introductory remarks.

Trish Allen, Susan Elledge Planning and Permitting Services, gave the applicant presentation, joined by Scott Shell, ATE.

Chair Lodge opened the public hearing at 1:27 P.M.

Steve Cushman, President, Santa Barbara Region Chamber of Commerce, spoke in support of the project.

With no one else wishing to speak, the public hearing was closed at 1:28 P.M.

Chair Lodge acknowledged receipt of a public comment letter from Paula Westbury, Santa Barbara, who was in opposition to the project.

The Planning Commission was supportive of Antioch University's commitment to the Santa Barbara community and its addition to the academic community.

MOTION: Schwartz/Larson

Assigned Resolution No. 016-11

Approved the project, making the revised findings for the Development Plan and recommendation to City Council for the Final Community Priority Designation, as outlined in the Staff Report and revised on August 11, 2011, subject to the Conditions of Approval in Exhibit A of the Staff Report.

This motion carried by the following vote:

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

Chair Lodge announced the ten calendar day appeal period.

IV. ENVIRONMENTAL HEARING:

ACTUAL TIME: 1:39 P.M.

**APPLICATION OF JAY BLATTER AND JULIE GUAJARDO McGEEVER,
AGENT FOR MALDONADO LIVING TRUST, 1820-1826 DE LA VINA STREET,
APN 027-022-022, -023, -024, R-4 MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL ZONE,
GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: HOTEL AND RESIDENTIAL, 12 UNITS PER
ACRE (MST2009-00536)**

The proposed project is a 40-unit Residential Care Facility for the Elderly (RCFE) designed to serve seniors suffering from Alzheimer's or various forms of dementia. Proposed construction includes a two-story, 24,128 net square foot building (25,400 gross sq. ft.). There is a sub-level cellar for food storage, laundry and mechanical equipment measuring 2,210 net square feet, and the first and second floors would be 8,581 and 13,337 net square feet, respectively. The project also includes 20 on grade parking spaces, of which 16 are covered and 4 are uncovered.

The existing structures on site are proposed to be demolished, including three houses (two of which are duplexes), two garages and one shed. Including attics, the floor area of the six existing structures totals 8,251 net square feet. There is an existing oak tree that is proposed to be preserved and included as part of the new site plan.

The purpose of the environmental hearing is to receive comments from the Planning Commission, interested agencies, and the public on the adequacy and completeness of the Draft Initial Study and Proposed Mitigated Declaration for the proposed project. Written comments on the Draft MND will be accepted through **May 12, 2011**.

No formal action on the development proposal or environmental document will take place at this hearing.

Case Planner: Kelly Brodison, Assistant Planner
Email: KBrodison@SantaBarbaraCA.gov

Phone: 805-564-5470, ext. 4531

Kelly Brodison, Assistant Planner, gave the Staff presentation.

Julie McGeever, Hochhauser & Blatter Architects, did not provide a presentation, but was available to answer the Commission's questions.

Chair Lodge opened the public hearing at 1:46 P.M.

Dawn Barnier, neighbor, expressed concern with traffic, parking, and noise associated with the project.

With no one else wishing to speak, the public hearing was closed at 1:58 P.M.

Commissioner's Comments:

1. Commissioner Jordan would like to see better information to support arguments made that the impact is less than significant or potentially significant but mitigable related to transportation (i.e. explain commercial deliveries, vehicle size, frequency, etc.); commented on the acceptability of the identified noise mitigation on the three units closest to the street; and requested additional information on the effectiveness of proposed mitigation for the large oak tree in the front.
2. Commissioners Bartlett and Lodge would like to see a more current Traffic Study that is applicable to this project and the understanding of the impact made by deliveries and the shuttle van logistics, as well as the impacts to traffic caused by employee shift changes. Commissioner Bartlett is not satisfied with the identified tree mitigation. Commissioner Lodge would also like to see more analysis on parking and trips and is concerned with the impact to the neighborhood.
3. Commissioners Jordan and Bartlett were not satisfied with the mitigation on the oak tree as being 3 5-gallon oak trees and would like mitigation that puts effort on not losing the tree and better mitigation. The mitigation for replacement should be equivalent to the current tree diameter.
4. Commissioner Schwartz does not see sufficient mitigation for what is seen as significant impacts to the immediate neighborhood. Would like to see more information about employees, visitors and deliveries and their impact on the street.

V. **ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA**

ACTUAL TIME: 2:27 P.M.

A. Committee and Liaison Reports.

1. Staff Hearing Officer Liaison Report

Commissioner Larson reported on the Staff Hearing Officer meeting held on August 10, 2011.

2. Other Committee and Liaison Reports

- a. Commissioner Larson reported on a conflict in attending the Historic Element Committee Meeting and the Sustainability Committee Meeting which both fell on the same date and within a half-hour start time. Asked the Commission for support in sharing liaison responsibilities for the Sustainability Committee.
- b. Commissioner Larson reported on the Historic Landmarks Commission meeting of August 3, 2011.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Lodge adjourned the meeting at 2:33 P.M.

Submitted by,

Julie Rodriguez, Planning Commission Secretary

DRAFT



City of Santa Barbara California

CITY OF SANTA BARBARA PLANNING COMMISSION

RESOLUTION NO. 016-11

602 ANACAPA STREET

DEVELOPMENT PLAN APPROVAL AND COMMUNITY PRIORITY DESIGNATION

AUGUST 11, 2011

APPLICATION OF TRISH ALLEN, SUZANNE ELLEDGE PLANNING AND PERMITTING SERVICES, AGENT FOR THE HUTTON FOUNDATION, 602 ANACAPA STREET, APN 031-151-017, C-M (COMMERCIAL MANUFACTURING) ZONE, GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: GENERAL OFFICE/MAJOR PUBLIC INSTITUTIONAL (MST2011-00145)

The project consists of a proposal to construct a 3,626 square foot (sf) addition, completely within the existing first floor volume of an existing mixed-use building, to create classrooms and offices for Antioch University. In order to meet Antioch's deadline for classes in September 2011, the project was split into three phases, to allow for construction of improvements as soon as building permits could be issued. Phase 1 is being processed under BLD2011-00501 for an interior tenant improvement that does not require discretionary review. Phase 2 is being processed under MST2011-00105, and includes the demolition of a 1,691 square foot mezzanine, and construction of a 2,646 sf new second floor completely within the existing ground floor volume. Phase 2 will use the remaining 955 sf balance from the Small Addition category. Phase 2 requires Development Plan Approval (DPA) by the Architectural Board of Review. Phase 3 includes an additional 980 sf of second floor area, and retains the 1,691 square foot mezzanine. Phase 3 would require DPA by the Planning Commission (PC) for cumulative non-residential additions exceeding 3,000 sf. The City Council approved a preliminary Community Priority allocation of 2,671 sf on May 17, 2011. If the timing allows, the applicant will eliminate the second phase, and proceed directly to PC for DPA for 3,626 sf of floor area (2,671 sf Community Priority + 955 sf Small Addition = 3,626 sf) prior to ABR approval of the architectural changes.

The discretionary applications required for this project are:

1. Design Review approval by the Architectural Board of Review.
2. A Development Plan to allow the construction of 3,626 square feet of nonresidential development (SBMC §28.87.300); and
3. A Final Community Priority Designation by City Council (SBMC §28.87.300)

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

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

WHEREAS, 1 person 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 4, 2011.
2. Revised Findings, August 11, 2011..
3. Site Plans

4. Correspondence received in opposition to the project:
 - a. Paula Westbury, Santa Barbara, CA

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

- I. Approved the subject application making the following findings and determinations:

A. DEVELOPMENT PLAN APPROVAL FINDINGS

The Planning Commission must find that the project meets all of the findings listed below.

1. The proposed development complies with all provisions of the zoning ordinance, as discussed in section V and VII.C of the Staff Report.
2. The proposed development is consistent with the principles of sound community planning.
The proposed project makes minor changes to the exterior of an existing building which will be consistent with the character and style of the surrounding architecture. The proposed use is consistent with surrounding commercial uses consisting of office, restaurant and retail uses in the downtown area as discussed in Section VII.A, B, and C. of the staff report.
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 project as designed, with the exception of the elevator tower on the proposed third floor, will not increase the overall size, bulk, or scale of the building. The elevator tower has been designed to be compatible with the existing architecture and to minimize the effects on the size, bulk and scale of the building as discussed in Section VII.B and C. of the staff report.
4. The proposed development will not have a significant unmitigated adverse impact upon City and South Coast affordable housing stock.
The project is a small addition that will not involve a significant number of employees creating new demand for low to moderate income housing in the area, as discussed in Section VII.C. of the staff report.
5. The proposed development will not have a significant unmitigated adverse impact on the City's water resources.
The project is a small addition that will not involve a significant incremental increase in water demand area, as discussed in Section VII.C. of the staff report.
6. The proposed development will not have a significant unmitigated adverse impact on the City's traffic; and
The project will generate peak hour trips that will not add result in an increase in trips at impacted intersections and will not involve a significant incremental increase in area traffic, as discussed in Section VII.C and D of the staff report.
7. Resources will be available and traffic improvements will be in place at the time of project occupancy.
The proposed project does not require any traffic improvements.

II. Said approval is subject to the following conditions:

- A. **Order of Development.** In order to accomplish the proposed development, the following steps shall occur in the order identified:
1. Obtain all required design review approvals.
 2. Pay Land Development Team Recovery Fee.
 3. Make application and obtain a Building Permit (BLD) to demolish any structures / improvements and/or perform rough grading. Comply with condition E "Construction Implementation Requirements."
 4. Record any required documents (see Recorded Conditions Agreement section).
 5. Permits.
 - a. Make application and obtain a Building Permit (BLD) for construction of approved development.
 - b. Make application and obtain a Public Works Permit (PBW) for all required public improvements.

Details on implementation of these steps are provided throughout the conditions of approval.

- B. **Recorded Conditions Agreement.** The Owner shall execute a *written instrument*, which shall be prepared by Planning staff, 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 August 11, 2011 is limited to 3,626 square feet of additional non-residential floor area within the existing first-story volume of the building and the improvements shown on the plans 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 continuation of any historic uninterrupted flow of water onto 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 Architectural Board of Review (ABR). Such plan shall not be modified unless prior written approval is obtained from the ABR. The landscaping on the Real Property shall be provided and maintained in accordance with said landscape plan, including any tree protection measures. If said landscaping is removed for any reason without approval by the ABR, the owner is responsible for its immediate replacement.
 5. **Common Area Maintenance.** All common/shared areas/facilities/improvements shall be kept open, available and maintained in the manner in which it was designed and permitted.

6. **Areas Available for Parking.** All parking areas and access thereto shall be kept open and available in the manner in which it was designed and permitted.
7. **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.

C. **Design Review.** The project, including public improvements, is subject to the review and approval of the Architectural Board of Review (ABR). The ABR shall not grant project design approval until the following ~~Planning Commission / Staff Hearing Officer~~ Planning Commission land use conditions have been satisfied.

1. **-Parks and Recreation Commission Tree Removal Approval.** Submit to the Planning Division verification of approval from the Parks and Recreation Commission for the removal of street trees.
2. **Screened Backflow Device.** The backflow devices for fire sprinklers, pools, spas, solar panels and/or irrigation systems shall be provided in a location screened from public view or included in the exterior wall of the building, as approved by the ABR.
3. **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.

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.

D. **Requirements Prior to Permit Issuance.** The Owner shall submit the following, or evidence of completion of the following, for review and approval by the Department listed below prior to the issuance of any permit for the project. Some of these conditions may be waived for demolition or rough grading permits, at the discretion of the department listed. Please note that these conditions are in addition to the standard submittal requirements for each department.

1. **Public Works Department.**

- a. **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*. Engineering Division Staff prepares said agreement for the Owner's signature.
- b. **Construction-Related Truck Trips.** Construction-related truck trips for trucks with a gross vehicle weight rating of three tons or more 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.) in order to help reduce truck traffic on adjacent streets and roadways.
- c. **Bicycle Parking.** Six bicycle parking spaces shall be provided. Their size and location shall be approved by the Transportation Manager.

2. **Community Development Department.**

- a. **Recordation of Agreements.** The Owner shall provide evidence of recordation of the written instrument that includes all of the Recorded Conditions identified in

condition B "Recorded Conditions Agreement" to the Community Development Department prior to issuance of any building permits.

- b. **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 draft copy of the notice to the Planning Division for review and approval.
- c. **Design Review Requirements.** Plans shall show all design, landscape and tree protection elements, as approved by the appropriate design review board and as outlined in Section C "Design Review," and all elements/specifications shall be implemented on-site.
- d. **Conditions on Plans/Signatures.** The final 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 sheet as follows: The undersigned have read and understand the required conditions, and agree to abide by any and all conditions which are their usual and customary responsibility to perform, and which are within their authority to perform.

Signed:

_____	_____	_____
Property Owner		Date
_____	_____	_____
Contractor	Date	License No.
_____	_____	_____
Architect	Date	License No.
_____	_____	_____
Engineer	Date	License No.

- E. **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, including demolition and grading.
 - 1. **Construction Contact Sign.** Immediately after Building permit issuance, signage shall be posted at the points of entry to the site that list the contractors name, contractors telephone numbers, construction work hours, site rules, and construction-related conditions, to assist Building Inspectors and Police Officers in the enforcement of the conditions of approval. The font size shall be a minimum of 0.5 inches in height. Said sign shall not exceed six feet in height from the ground if it is free-standing or placed on a fence. It shall not exceed 24 square feet if in a multi-family or commercial zone or six square feet if in a single family zone.
 - 2. **Construction Storage/Staging.** Construction vehicle/ equipment/ materials storage and staging shall be done on-site. No parking or storage shall be permitted within the public

right-of-way, unless specifically permitted by the Transportation Manager with a Public Works permit.

3. **Unanticipated Archaeological Resources Contractor Notification.** Standard discovery measures shall be implemented per the City master Environmental Assessment throughout grading and construction: 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. If such archaeological resources are encountered or suspected, work shall be halted immediately, the City Environmental Analyst shall be notified and the Owner 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.

A final report on the results of the archaeological monitoring shall be submitted by the City-approved archaeologist to the Environmental Analyst within 180 days of completion of the monitoring and prior to any certificate of occupancy for the project.

- F. **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 public improvements (curbs, gutters, sidewalks, roadways, etc.) or property damaged 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 a qualified arborist.
- G. **General Conditions.**
 1. **Prior Conditions.** These conditions are in addition to the conditions identified in Planning Commission 009-86.

2. **Compliance with Requirements.** All requirements of the city of Santa Barbara and any other applicable requirements of any law or agency of the State and/or any government entity or District shall be met. This includes, but is not limited to, the Endangered Species Act of 1973 [ESA] and any amendments thereto (16 U.S.C. § 1531 et seq.), the 1979 Air Quality Attainment Plan, and the California Code of Regulations.
3. **Approval Limitations.**
 - a. The conditions of this approval supersede all conflicting notations, specifications, dimensions, and the like which may be shown on submitted plans.
 - b. All buildings, roadways, parking areas and other features shall be located substantially as shown on the plans approved by the ~~Planning Commission / Staff Hearing Officer~~ Planning Commission.
 - c. Any deviations from the project description, approved plans or conditions must be reviewed and approved by the City, in accordance with the Planning Commission Guidelines. Deviations may require changes to the permit and/or further environmental review. Deviations without the above-described approval will constitute a violation of permit approval.
4. **Land Development Team Recovery Fee Required.** The land development team recovery fee (30% of all planning fees, as calculated by staff) shall be paid at time of building permit application.
5. **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 being notified of a lawsuit regarding 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 DEVELOPMENT PLAN TIME LIMITS:

The development plan approved, per Santa Barbara Municipal Code §28.87.350, shall expire four (4) years from the date of approval unless:

1. A building or grading permit for the work authorized by the development plan is issued prior to the expiration date of the approval.
2. The Community Development Director grants an extension of the development plan approval upon finding that the applicant has demonstrated due diligence in implementing and completing the proposed project. The Community Development Director may grant one (1) one-year extension of the development plan approval.

NOTICE OF TIME LIMITS FOR PROJECTS WITH MULTIPLE APPROVALS (S.B.M.C. § 28.87.370):

If multiple discretionary applications are approved for the same project, the expiration date of all discretionary approvals shall correspond with the longest expiration date specified by any of the land use discretionary applications, unless such extension would conflict with state or federal law. The expiration date of all approvals shall be measured from date of the final action of the City on the longest discretionary land use approval related to the application, unless otherwise specified by state or federal law.

This motion was passed and adopted on the 11th day of August, 2011 by the Planning Commission of the City of Santa Barbara, by the following vote:

AYES: 6 NOES: 0 ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 1 (Jostes)

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

PLEASE BE ADVISED:

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



City of Santa Barbara Planning Division

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

August 18, 2011

CALL TO ORDER:

Chair Jostes called the meeting to order at 1:00 P.M.

I. ROLL CALL

Chair John Jostes, Vice Chair Sheila Lodge, Commissioners Bruce Bartlett, Charmaine Jacobs, Mike Jordan, Stella Larson, and Deborah L. Schwartz.

Bruce Bartlett arrived at 1:01 P.M.

STAFF PRESENT:

N. Scott Vincent, Assistant City Attorney
 Steve Foley, Supervising Transportation Planner
 Michael Berman, Project Planner/Environmental Analyst
 Allison De Busk, Project Planner
 Julie Rodriguez, Planning Commission Secretary

II. PRELIMINARY MATTERS:

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

None.

- B. Announcements and appeals.

Allison DeBusk, Project Planner announced that the Planning Commission meeting of August 25, 2011 has been cancelled. On August 25, 2011, there will be a special meeting of the Planning Commission and Fire and Police Commission in Council Chambers at 4 P.M.

Commissioner Jacobs announced that she will not be in attendance at the special meeting.

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

Chair Jostes opened the public hearing at 1:01 P.M. and, with no one wishing to speak, closed the hearing.

III. ENVIRONMENTAL HEARING:

ACTUAL TIME: 1:01 P.M.

APPLICATION OF CITY OF SANTA BARBARA, PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT, ENGINEERING DIVISION, JEFF PALMER, PROJECT MANAGER, 200 BLOCK CHAPALA STREET, APN: ROW-002-070, HRC-2 / SD-3 (HOTEL AND RELATED COMMERCIAL / COASTAL OVERLAY) ZONES, GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: GENERAL COMMERCE (MST2010-00263/CDP2011-00007)

The project would demolish the existing 4,655 square foot (s.f.) bridge deck and replace it with a 2,740 s.f. bridge deck. The south side of the new bridge deck would be supported on piles and a foundation behind the existing sandstone abutment. The north side of the new bridge would be supported by a new abutment that would be located in the same location as the existing abutment. The new bridge would provide one vehicular lane in each direction and a five foot sidewalk on each side. New bridge railings and approaches to the bridge would be constructed.

The purpose of the environmental hearing is to receive comments from the Planning Commission, interested agencies, and the public on the adequacy and completeness of the Draft Initial Study and Proposed Mitigated Declaration for the proposed project. Written comments on the Draft MND will be accepted through **August 26, 2011**.

No formal action on the development proposal or environmental document will take place at this hearing.

Case Planner: Michael Berman, Project Planner/Environmental Analyst
Email: MBerman@SantaBarbaraCA.gov Phone: 805-564-5470, ext. 4558

Michael Berman, Project Planner/Environmental Analyst, gave the Staff presentation. Jessica Grant, Project Planner, was available to respond to the Commission's questions.

Jeff Palmer, Public Works Engineer, gave the applicant presentation.

Chair Jostes opened the public hearing at 1:51 P.M., and with no one wishing to speak, the public hearing was closed.

The Commissioners made the following comments:

1. Commissioner Jacobs appreciated the considerations made for traffic and circulation, particularly for pedestrians and bicycles. Would appreciate more attention to the landscaping when it returns to Historic Landmarks Commission (HLC).
2. Many Commissioners suggested keeping the neighbors involved, especially in the demolition phase given the noise involved. Did not feel that the noise levels could be mitigated solely with sound walls or sound blankets. Would like neighborhood to be made aware, beyond noticing. Would also like mitigation considerations so that

- other neighboring projects do not occur simultaneously. Commissioner Jostes added that when updating environmental review procedures that better mitigation is needed for short term nuisance impacts, particularly when pile drivers are used.
3. Commissioner Jordan felt there was a lack of reconciliation on what exists now and what will be put in. There is a lack of response in the noise/traffic sections to the increased capacity and what will happen when the public is more aware of its existence and begin increasing its use. Would like to see traffic counts include projections.
 4. Commissioner Jordan was not on board with the concept but appreciated the alternatives offered. Would like to see consideration given to as small a width of bridge as possible.
 5. Commissioner Bartlett felt that the environmental impacts and mitigations were in line with the amount of construction that is being proposed for the replacement bridge. Not comfortable with over all premise of the project and was concerned with amount of money being spent on the bridge replacement; seems adsorbent amount for a bridge that is not used often.
 6. Commissioner Bartlett was concerned with view blockage from train depot and would like some view studies given to the HLC that show what the bridge looks like in place. Does not agree with changing all parking adjacent to the railroad park from 90 degree to angled parking. Suggested aligning all crosswalks on either side of Yanonali Street so that they line up with each other.
 7. Commissioner Larson would like the reduction in square footage to be as great as possible. Urged the removal of existing graffiti and treating of sandstone so that it is protected. Suggested Arundo abatement due to the Arundo being invasive and splitting the sandstone.
 8. Commissioner Schwartz appreciated the structural and seismic improvements, and asked to also consider making improvements to balancing traffic circulation without encouraging more traffic. Felt that there is a need to design the bridge configuration with appropriate lighting to deter crime in the area. Appreciated the undergrounding of utilities and the fact that the majority of funding is leveraged so that city funding is a modest contribution.
 9. Commissioner Jostes commented on the air quality of the NMD and needed to understand how a bridge will create 3.6 tons/year of CO2 emissions. Suggested looking at the model assumptions made to see if the number is credible.
 10. Some Commissioners suggested that the Applicant, prior to requesting a Coastal Development Permit, return for a concept review to look at expanding the map to include expanded development and consider a more in-depth review of alternative options.

Jeff Palmer offered to review the alternatives with the Commission but also stated that after much review Staff was presenting the best option.

Scott Vincent, Assistant City Attorney, said that it would be appropriate to increase the scope in the Staff Report when it returns for the Coastal Development Permit. The Staff Report could also include a discussion of what alternatives were considered and why they were not pursued further.

IV. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

ACTUAL TIME: 2:47 P.M.

A. Committee and Liaison Reports.

1. Staff Hearing Officer Liaison Report

None was given.

2. Other Committee and Liaison Reports

a. Commissioner Larson reported on the Historic Landmarks Commission meeting of August 17, 2011.

b. Commissioner Lodge reported on the Grand Opening of the Airport Terminal on August 17, 2011.

V. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Jostes adjourned the meeting at 2:52 P.M.

Submitted by,

Julie Rodriguez, Planning Commission Secretary