



City of Santa Barbara Planning Division

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

April 4, 2013

CALL TO ORDER:

Chair Jordan called the meeting to order at 1:03 P.M.

I. ROLL CALL

Chair Mike Jordan, Vice Chair Deborah L. Schwartz, Commissioners Bruce Bartlett, John P. Campanella, Sheila Lodge, June Pujo, and Addison Thompson.

STAFF PRESENT:

Jim Armstrong, City Administrator
 Danny Kato, Senior Planner
 Renee Brooke, Senior Planner
 Steve Wiley, City Attorney
 Scott Vincent, Assistant City Attorney
 Rob Dayton, Principal Transportation Planner
 Stacey Wilson, Associate Transportation Planner
 Allison De Busk, Project Planner
 Jill Zachary, Assistant Parks and Recreation Director
 Steve Greer, Environmental Analyst
 Julie Rodriguez, Planning Commission Secretary
 Rosa Rogers O'Reilly, Commission Secretary

II. PRELIMINARY MATTERS:

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

1. Draft Minutes of March 14, 2013
2. Resolution 005-13
1210 Olive Street
3. Draft Minutes of March 21, 2013
4. Resolution 006-13
1533 and 1537 Shoreline Drive

MOTION: Thompson/Schwartz

Approve the minutes and resolutions of March 14, 2013.

This motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 5 Noes: 0 Abstain: 2 (Jordan, Pujo) Absent: 0

MOTION: Thompson/Schwartz

Approve the minutes and resolutions of March 21, 2013 as corrected.

This motion carried by the following vote:

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

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

Chair Jordan opened the public hearing at 1:07 P.M. and, with no one wishing to speak, closed the hearing.

III. SUBSTANTIAL CONFORMANCE DETERMINATION:

ACTUAL TIME: 1:08 P.M.

RECUSAL: To avoid any actual or perceived conflict of interest, Commissioner Bartlett recused himself from hearing this item because his architectural firm is the architect for the project. Commissioner Bartlett left the dais at 1:08 P.M.

APPLICATION OF DOUG FELL, AGENT FOR 35 STATE STREET HOTEL PARTNERS, LLC; 35, 36 AND 118 STATE STREET (“ENTRADA DE SANTA BARBARA”); APN: 033-081-013, 033-102-018, 033-111-013; HRC-2/S-D-3 ZONES, GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: OCEAN RELATED COMMERCE/MEDIUM HIGH RESIDENTIAL (15-27 UNITS/AC), LOCAL COASTAL PLAN LAND USE DESIGNATION: HOTEL AND RELATED COMMERCE II/BUFFER (MST97-00357)

The purpose of this discussion item is to inform the Planning Commission of proposed changes to the Entrada de Santa Barbara (“Entrada”) Project, approved by the City Council on December 11, 2001, within the context of a request to the City for a Substantial Conformance Determination (SCD). The Entrada Project involves the redevelopment of portions of three blocks of properties totaling 2.41 acres at the intersection of State Street and Mason Street with hotel/timeshare units and commercial square footage, as well as public improvements along State Street, Mason Street and Helena Avenue. Area A is 35 State Street (former Californian Hotel); Area B is 36 State Street (current location of Hot Spots), Area C is 118 State Street (previously developed with commercial buildings that were demolished to begin construction of the underground parking garage for the project; currently vacant and surrounded by a green fence).

Key proposed changes include:

- Change from 114 hotel units and 9 timeshare units to 123 hotel units and no timeshare units. This results in a reduction of hotel-related square footage.

- Slight increase in the amount of public commercial square footage (from 21,654 square feet to 22,326 square feet).
- Consolidating all hotel units onto Areas A and B.
- Consolidating almost all parking onto Area C. Approximately 10 parking spaces would remain on Areas A and B for queuing and hotel operator needs. This eliminates the underground parking on Area B. On Area C, all hotel parking (140 spaces) would be valet and provided below grade; all public parking (124 spaces) would be provided in the three-level above grade parking structure.
- Changes to the layout of Area C, including moving the retail space back to the State Street frontage and revising/relocating the public plaza. This results in changes to the massing of development on Area C due to relocation of buildings and public plaza area.
- Changes to site plans for each Area, including changes to encroachments into required setbacks, for which modifications were originally granted.
- Proposing to construct the entire project, including Stage 2 and 3 of the offsite improvements, as one phase.

The City Administrator will ultimately make a determination as to whether the proposed changes are in substantial conformance with the approved Project.

The purpose of the discussion is to allow the Planning Commission an opportunity to review the proposed changes to the Project and provide input to the Community Development Department with regard to the SCD request.

Case Planner: Allison DeBusk, Project Planner

Email: ADeBusk@SantaBarbaraCA.gov

Phone: (805) 564-5470, ext. 4552.

Allison DeBusk, Project Planner, gave the Staff presentation. Stacey Wilson, Associate Transportation Planner; Jim Armstrong, City Administrator; Rob Dayton, Principal Transportation Planner; and Derrick Bailey, Supervising Transportation Engineer were available to answer questions.

Michael Rosenfeld, 35 State Street Hotel Partners LLC, gave the Applicant presentation, joined by the DesignARC team: Melisa Cinarli, Project Manager, and Mark Shields, Architect.

Chair Jordan opened the public hearing at 1:44 P.M.

The following people spoke in support of the project:

1. Lynette Hall
2. Aaron Lynch
3. Shelley Shulte
4. Michael Erickson
5. Jackie Waddill
6. Robin Himovitz
7. Barbara Schoch

8. Kenny Slaughter
9. Mark Romasanta
10. Bonnie Donovan
11. Ray Mahboob

With no one else wishing to speak, the public hearing was closed at 1:56 P.M.

The consensus of the Commission was to support the Substantial Conformance Determination (SCD). The Commissioners made the following comments:

1. Commissioner Campanella felt the SCD request conforms to the original approval and intent for this gateway, as well as to later iterations of the project. Likes the idea of including an area for art on Area C. The common area should be for public use and not strictly hotel guests (e.g. wedding set-up). Suggested the area near the Funk Zone and Helena Street blend in with the Funk Zone and be an entry for an expression of art that people can see. Consider creating more areas for creative displays; obtain community artist input; keep flexibility in any display areas so art can be rotated. Bulb-outs on Helena may detract from existing activities that currently take place in the street. Suggested looking at first floor rooms that border Helena Street, might be a good place for commercial space that would blend in with the Funk Zone, rather than hotel rooms that may be less appropriate uses.
2. Commissioner Thompson acknowledged that the long process has resulted in an improved project, and supports the SCD as being in conformance with the original approval. He is not convinced one lane in each direction on State Street is a good idea.
3. Commissioner Lodge agreed that this is a better project and shared some concerns with the SCD not being consistent with the SCD approved in 2010. Noted that views are improved over the original, but not over the 2010 SCD project. Likes the commercial space on Mason/Helena Street corner. The 2010 SCD project Area C plaza was more inviting and not as closed off; suggested a compromise between the 2010 SCD project and this current proposal in the amount of commercial frontage on State Street to open it up more. Area A is a constricted area; suggested that it would be more in conformance if the new addition lined up with existing Californian Hotel.
4. Commissioner Pujo agreed that the project is substantially conforming and meets the goals that were originally identified. Would like to see an arcade in Area C more like the original approval and more consistent with the arches in the arcades shown in Areas A and B. Would like to see the Area C plaza design and landscape components more refined and reflective of Santa Barbara tradition; there is a lot of grass, there should be more native plants, it is not interesting enough, there should be more shade and more furniture. There needs to be strong cues to the public and pedestrians that this area is inviting and can be used by the public. Would like to see the Helena end of the Area B paseo have a visual connection; it should be more prominent and inviting. Would like attention given to the street frontage of Mason Street where the valet is located and consider how a pedestrian would have access

- through the valet area without having to cross the street to avoid all of the associated congestion.
5. Commissioner Schwartz was also in support of the SCD and was glad to see it moving forward with an experienced hotel developer. However, she is concerned with the valet operation, traffic circulation and Helena improvements. This project can honor traditional Santa Barbara and also reference the uniqueness of the Funk Zone; the back-of-house area should not look like a typical hotel back-of-house. Encourages creativity outside the box that is stimulating to locals and tourist. Create a sense of place at the corner of Area C.
 6. Commissioner Jordan could not find the project in conformance, but would be able to if the following were addressed:
 - a. Would like to see the plaza component adjacent to the visitor information center in the original plan put back into the plans.
 - b. Agrees with earlier comments made about Areas B and C to encourage public use of the plaza and paseos; and that could include amenities such as seating areas or furniture. Would like the Area C plaza to be not just a mass of grass, but small grass areas broken up by walking paths and benches that are inviting. Applicant needs to work harder to “encourage” public use of the spaces.
 - c. The original Planning Commission approval had a myriad of improvements that encouraged access to transit with a covered and obvious shuttle stop location; the previously approved bus stop sign pole with a turn out does not accomplish the original intent. Suggested moving the shuttle stop to in front of the visitor information center by moving over four trees and bringing the curb back in, instead of a landscaping area, and make a shuttle turn out. Should mimic the existing covered bench as referenced in earlier conditions that called for lighted and covered bus and transit facilities.
 - d. Concurred with Commissioner Pujo on the Area B paseo and would like to see it be a pedestrian paseo that maintains the width all the way to Helena Street. There should not be loading or storage at the end of it. The paseo needs to entice people in; don’t create visual barriers. Noted that the improvements shown on the elevation on State Street do not encourage pedestrians to go by the fountain and the steps, perhaps moving the fountain into the paseo would be a better configuration.
 - e. Shared same concern as Commissioner Pujo and was not comfortable with the front of the lobby on Mason Street and the potential for queuing vehicles waiting for valet parking with the unknown level of activity in a public right-of-way.
 - f. Concerned that the public would not know about the public parking lot; it needs a plan to announce it. And it should have pedestrian access from Helena.
 - g. Also commented that he doesn’t like the narrowing of State Street, thinks it will affect traffic circulation negatively.

****Chair Jordan called for a recess at 3:49 P.M. and reconvened at 4:10 P.M.****

IV. DISCUSSION ITEM:

ACTUAL TIME: 4:10 P.M.

Commissioner Bartlett returned to the dais.

URBAN FORESTRY MASTER PLAN PROJECT.

The Planning Commission will receive a status update on the Urban Forestry Master Plan, and provide comments on its Urban Forest Key Issues and Draft Objectives.

Case Planner: Jill Zachary, Assistant Parks and Recreation Director

Email: JZachary@SantaBarbaraCA.gov

Phone: (805) 564-5470, ext. 5437

Jill Zachary, Assistant Parks and Recreation Director, gave the Staff presentation.

Chair Jordan opened the public hearing at 4:30 P.M., and with no one wishing to speak, closed the hearing.

The Commission appreciated staff's work and looks forward to seeing the plan executed. Suggestions included partnering with non profits, providing a glossary of terms, designating opportunity sites to receive mitigation trees and educating the public on environmental benefits.

V. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

ACTUAL TIME: 5:04 P.M.

A. Committee and Liaison Reports.

1. Staff Hearing Officer Liaison Report

Commissioner Lodge reported on the Staff Hearing Officer meeting held on April 3, 2013.

2. Other Committee and Liaison Reports

a. Commissioner Bartlett announced that today was First Thursday.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Jordan adjourned the meeting at 5:07 P.M.

Submitted by,

Julie Rodriguez, Planning Commission Secretary

DRAFT



City of Santa Barbara Planning Division

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

April 11, 2013

CALL TO ORDER:

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

I. ROLL CALL

Vice Chair Deborah L. Schwartz, Commissioners Bruce Bartlett, John P. Campanella, Sheila Lodge, June Pujo, and Addison Thompson.

Absent: Commissioner Mike Jordan

STAFF PRESENT:

Bettie Weiss, City Planner
John Ledbetter, Principal Planner
Renee Brooke, Senior Planner
David Rowell, Housing Program Specialist
N. Scott Vincent, Assistant City Attorney
Irma Unzueta, 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.

Ms. Brooke made the following announcements:

1. There will be a Special Joint Meeting of the City Council and Planning Commission on April 17, 2013 in the David Gebhard Public Meeting Room at 630 Garden Street.
2. The Planning Commission meeting of April 18, 2013 has been cancelled.
3. There will be a Special Meeting of the Planning Commission on April 25, 2013 in City Council Chambers beginning at 1 P.M.

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

Chair Schwartz opened the public hearing at 1:03 P.M. and, with no one wishing to speak, closed the hearing.

III. RECOMMENDATION TO CITY COUNCIL:

ACTUAL TIME: 1:03 P.M.

AVERAGE UNIT-SIZE DENSITY INCENTIVE PROGRAM

On April 10, 2012, the City Council initiated amendments to the City's Zoning Ordinance to carry out policies in the Land Use and Housing Elements of the 2011 General Plan pertaining to the implementation of the Average Unit-Size Density Incentive Program (AUD). The purpose of the meeting is for the Planning Commission to review and forward recommendations to the City Council concerning adding Chapter 28.20 to the Santa Barbara Municipal Code implementing the Average Unit-Size Density Incentive Program. Amendments to various sections of the Municipal Code are also proposed related to building heights, outdoor living space standards and encroachments in open yards.

The Environmental Analyst has determined that the project is exempt from further environmental review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act Statutes Sections 21083.3 and Guidelines Section 15183.

Case Planner: Irma Unzueta, Project Planner

Email: IUnzueta@SantaBarbaraCA.gov

Phone: (805) 564-5470, ext. 4562.

Irma Unzueta, Project Planner, gave the Staff presentation.

Chair Schwartz opened the public hearing at 1:22 P.M.

The following people commented on the AUD Program

1. Bonnie Freeman is supportive of the AUD Program and was curious as to how this plan would impact her single family home and the ability to add a unit to her property.
2. Trish Allen, Suzanne Elledge Planning and Permitting Services, was supportive of the program. Expressed concern that site-constrained properties could meet the program in unit sizes, but would not reach the lowest level of the density allowed for the medium high category of the program and could miss out on incentives.
3. Brian Nelson, Architect, wanted clarification on language that could impact his future developments. Submitted handouts showing his concerns with common outdoor living space and private outdoor living space restrictions as too restrictive.
4. Lisa Plowman, SB4All, suggested that residential projects in commercial zones have the same setbacks as mixed use, with the exception of ground floor residential units. Suggested similar requirement for both AUD mixed use and exclusively residential projects in commercial zones.

5. Detlev Peikert, SB4All, was also in support of the AUD Program and submitted suggested ordinance revisions related to setbacks, open space and building height findings.
6. Robert Burke would like the 45' limit to be the maximum, without exception.

With no one else wishing to speak, the public hearing was closed at 1:46 P.M.

Commissioner Lodge left the dais at 4:50 P.M. and returned at 4:53 P.M.

MOTION: Pujio/Lodge

Assigned Resolution No. 007-13

Support the AUD Ordinance and make the following recommendations to City Council

I. **HOUSING TYPES:**

- o Include Average Unit-Size Density Incentive Program definition
- o Clarify that under Employee Sponsored Housing, each residential unit shall include one person who works on the south coast region of Santa Barbara County.
- o Clarify language to include that each residential unit is a primary residence for occupants.
- o Clarify that inclusionary units are not required for employer sponsored housing projects.
- o Under section D. Employer Sponsored Housing, change language from "must" to "shall" record a written instrument against the real property.
- o Allow a mix of priority housing types within a project.
- o Change Limited-Equity Housing Cooperative to be affordable to households earning 'up to' 250% of the Area Medium Income" and specify that it is an entry only requirement.

II. **DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS:**

a. **Setbacks (Pages 12-14):**

- o Revise AUD Ordinance, section 28.20.070, to incorporate SB4All recommended text related to front setbacks:

1. C-2 and C-M Zones

a. Front Setback

iii. Lots Developed Exclusively with Residential Uses. Any lot developed exclusively with residential buildings or structures shall ~~provide the R-3/R-4 setback distance as required by Section 28.20.070. B.2. of this chapter~~ observe the following setback: A front setback of ten (10) feet shall be provided. A portion of a structure may be located within the required front setback provided the footprint area of the portion of the structure that intrudes into the required front setback is compensated by an equal or greater

area that is not covered by any building or structure outside of and adjacent to the same front setback and the setback line. The compensating area shall not be located farther from the adjacent front lot line than one half of the length of the front lot line.

3. All other Zones

b. Lots Developed Exclusively with Residential Uses. Any lot developed exclusively with residential buildings or structures shall provide the R-3/R-4 setback distance as required by Section 28.20.070. B.2. of this chapter observe the following setback: A front setback of ten (10) feet shall be provided. A portion of a structure may be located within the required front setback provided the footprint area of the portion of the structure that intrudes into the required front setback is compensated by an equal or greater area that is not covered by any building or structure outside of and adjacent to the same front setback and the setback line. The compensating area shall not be located farther from the adjacent front lot line than one half of the length of the front lot line.

b. Outdoor Living Space (Pages 17 and 18):

- o Revise AUD Ordinance to incorporate SB4All recommended text related to outdoor living space that adds “or exclusively residential projects in commercial zone districts” after mixed use project language.

III. BUILDING HEIGHTS AND FINDINGS:

- o Under Building Heights, remove the language “as opposed to purely financial justification”.
- o Include and define the term “Livability” in the building Heights and Findings.
- o Include definition of “Distinctive”.
- o Under Livability, include a reference to the quality of materials and amenities and proximity to goods and services.

IV. REVIEW AND APPROVAL PROCESS:

- Under finding 3 for Community Benefit Projects, change the word “other” to “any” nearby designated historic resources.
- Suggested that Performance Measures be included in the Ordinance.
- Under Performance Measures, include definitions of turnover and vacancy rates.
- Provide periodic updates to Planning Commission.

This motion carried by the following vote:

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

With respect to requests for building height exceptions, Commissioners were split 3-3 on agreement for a required Super Majority vote and ability to appeal the decision to City Council.

While most Commissioners agreed with the proposed AUD Ordinance, Commissioners Campanella and Bartlett felt that the inclusionary housing requirement should not be applied to the market rate housing allowed under the AUD Ordinance and that the average unit sizes allowed under the Medium-High density tier should be larger.

IV. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

ACTUAL TIME: 5:05 P.M.

D. Committee and Liaison Reports.

1. Staff Hearing Officer Liaison Report

None was given.

2. Other Committee and Liaison Reports

a. Commissioner Lodge reported on the Historic Landmarks Commission meeting of April 9, 2013.

b. Commissioner Schwartz reported on the Downtown Parking Committee she attended earlier in the day.

V. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Schwartz adjourned the meeting at 5:08 P.M.

Submitted by,

Julie Rodriguez, Planning Commission Secretary



City of Santa Barbara California

CITY OF SANTA BARBARA PLANNING COMMISSION

RESOLUTION NO. 007-13

CITY-WIDE

RECOMMENDATION TO CITY COUNCIL ON

APRIL 11, 2013

AVERAGE UNIT-SIZE DENSITY INCENTIVE PROGRAM

On April 10, 2012, the City Council initiated amendments to the City's Zoning Ordinance to carry out policies in the Land Use and Housing Elements of the 2011 General Plan pertaining to the implementation of the Average Unit-Size Density Incentive Program. The purpose of the meeting is for the Planning Commission to review and forward recommendations to the City Council concerning adding Chapter 28.20 to the Santa Barbara Municipal Code implementing the Average Unit-Size Density Incentive Program. Amendments to various sections of the Municipal Code are also proposed related to building heights, outdoor living space standards and encroachments in open yards.

The Environmental Analyst has determined that the project is exempt from further environmental review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act Statutes Sections 21083.3 and Guidelines Section 15183.

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

WHEREAS, 6 people appeared to speak in favor of the program, and no one appeared to speak in opposition thereto, and the following exhibits were presented for the record:

1. Staff Report with Attachments, April 4, 2013.
2. Correspondence received in support of the project:
 - a. Lisa Plowman, SB4ALL, Santa Barbara, CA
3. 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 recommendation of the Average Unit-Size Density Incentive Program to City Council making the following recommendations:
 - I. HOUSING TYPES:
 - Include Average Unit-Size Density Incentive Program definition
 - Clarify that under Employee Sponsored Housing, each residential unit shall include one person who works on the south coast region of Santa Barbara County.
 - Clarify language to include that each residential unit is a primary residence for occupants.
 - Clarify that inclusionary units are not required for employer sponsored housing projects.
 - Under section D. Employer Sponsored Housing, change language from "must" to "shall" record a written instrument against the real property.
 - Allow a mix of priority housing types within a project.

- Change Limited-Equity Housing Cooperative to be affordable to households earning ‘up to’ 250% of the Area Medium Income” and specify that it is an entry only requirement.

II. DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS:

a. Setbacks (Pages 12-14):

- Revise AUD Ordinance, section 28.20.070, to incorporate SB4All recommended text related to front setbacks:

1. C-2 and C-M Zones

a. Front Setback

iii. Lots Developed Exclusively with Residential Uses. Any lot developed exclusively with residential buildings or structures shall ~~provide the R-3/R-4 setback distance as required by Section 28.20.070, B.2. of this chapter~~ observe the following setback: A front setback of ten (10) feet shall be provided. A portion of a structure may be located within the required front setback provided the footprint area of the portion of the structure that intrudes into the required front setback is compensated by an equal or greater area that is not covered by any building or structure outside of and adjacent to the same front setback and the setback line. The compensating area shall not be located farther from the adjacent front lot line than one half of the length of the front lot line.

3. All other Zones

b. Lots Developed Exclusively with Residential Uses. Any lot developed exclusively with residential buildings or structures shall ~~provide the R-3/R-4 setback distance as required by Section 28.20.070, B.2. of this chapter~~ observe the following setback: A front setback of ten (10) feet shall be provided. A portion of a structure may be located within the required front setback provided the footprint area of the portion of the structure that intrudes into the required front setback is compensated by an equal or greater area that is not covered by any building or structure outside of and adjacent to the same front setback and the setback line. The compensating area shall not be located farther from the adjacent front lot line than one half of the length of the front lot line.

b. Outdoor Living Space (Pages 17 and 18):

- Revise AUD Ordinance to incorporate SB4All recommended text related to outdoor living space that adds “or exclusively residential projects in commercial zone districts” after mixed use project language.

III. BUILDING HEIGHTS AND FINDINGS:

- Under Building Heights, remove the language “as opposed to purely financial justification”.
- Include and define the term “Livability” in the building Heights and Findings.
- Under Livability, include a reference to the quality of materials and amenities and proximity to goods and services.
- Include definition of “Distinctive”.

IV. REVIEW AND APPROVAL PROCESS:

- Under finding 3 for Community Benefit Projects, change the word “other” to “any” nearby designated historic resources.
- Suggested that Performance Measures be included in the Ordinance.
- Under Performance Measures, include definitions of turnover and vacancy rates.
- Provide periodic updates to Planning Commission

This motion was passed and adopted on the 11th day of April, 2013 by the Planning Commission of the City of Santa Barbara, by the following vote:

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

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

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

Chair Schwartz opened the public hearing at 1:03 P.M. and, with no one wishing to speak, closed the hearing.

III. RECOMMENDATION TO CITY COUNCIL:

ACTUAL TIME: 1:03 P.M.

AVERAGE UNIT-SIZE DENSITY INCENTIVE PROGRAM

On April 10, 2012, the City Council initiated amendments to the City's Zoning Ordinance to carry out policies in the Land Use and Housing Elements of the 2011 General Plan pertaining to the implementation of the Average Unit-Size Density Incentive Program (AUD). The purpose of the meeting is for the Planning Commission to review and forward recommendations to the City Council concerning adding Chapter 28.20 to the Santa Barbara Municipal Code implementing the Average Unit-Size Density Incentive Program. Amendments to various sections of the Municipal Code are also proposed related to building heights, outdoor living space standards and encroachments in open yards.

The Environmental Analyst has determined that the project is exempt from further environmental review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act Statutes Sections 21083.3 and Guidelines Section 15183.

Case Planner: Irma Unzueta, Project Planner

Email: IUnzueta@SantaBarbaraCA.gov

Phone: (805) 564-5470, ext. 4562.

Irma Unzueta, Project Planner, gave the Staff presentation.

Chair Schwartz opened the public hearing at 1:22 P.M.

The following people commented on the AUD Program

1. Bonnie Freeman is supportive of the AUD Program and was curious as to how this plan would impact her single family home and the ability to add a unit to her property.
2. Trish Allen, Suzanne Elledge Planning and Permitting Services, was supportive of the program. Expressed concern that site-constrained properties could meet the program in unit sizes but would not reach the lowest level of the density allowed for the medium high category of the program and could miss out on incentives.
3. Brian Nelson, Architect, wanted clarification on language that could impact his future developments. Submitted handouts showing his concerns with common outdoor living space and private outdoor living space restrictions as too restrictive.
4. Lisa Plowman, SB4All, suggested that residential projects in commercial zones have the same setbacks as mixed use, with the exception of ground floor residential units. Suggested similar requirement for both AUD mixed use and exclusively residential projects in commercial zones.

5. Detlev Peikert, SB4All, was also in support of the AUD Program and submitted suggested ordinance revisions related to setbacks, open space and building height findings.
6. Robert Burke would like the 45' limit to be the maximum, without exception.

With no one else wishing to speak, the public hearing was closed at 1:46 P.M.

Commissioner Lodge left the dais at 4:50 P.M. and returned at 4:53 P.M.

MOTION: Pujo/Lodge

Assigned Resolution No. 007-13

Support the AUD Ordinance and make the following recommendations to City Council

- I. **HOUSING TYPES:**
 - o Include Average Unit-Size Density Incentive Program definition
 - o Clarify that under Employee Sponsored Housing, each residential unit shall include one person who works on the south coast region of Santa Barbara County.
 - o Clarify language to include that each residential unit is a primary residence for occupants.
 - o Clarify that inclusionary units are not required for employer sponsored housing projects.
 - o Under section D. Employer Sponsored Housing, change language from “must” to “shall” record a written instrument against the real property.
 - o Allow a mix of priority housing types within a project.
 - o Change Limited-Equity Housing Cooperative to be affordable to households earning ‘up to’ 250% of the Area Medium Income” and specify that it is an entry only requirement.
- II. **DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS:**
 - a. **Setbacks:**
 - o Revise AUD Ordinance to incorporate SB4All recommended text related to front setbacks.
 - b. **Open Space:**
 - o Revise AUD Ordinance to incorporate SB4All recommended text related to outdoor living open space.
- III. **BUILDING HEIGHTS AND FINDINGS:**
 - o Under Building Heights, remove the language “as opposed to purely financial justification”.
 - o Include and define the term “Livability” in the building Heights and Findings.
 - o Include definition of “Distinctive”.
 - o Under Livability, include a reference to the quality of materials and amenities and proximity to goods and services.

IV. REVIEW AND APPROVAL PROCESS:

- o Under finding 3 for Community Benefit Projects, change the word “other” to “any” nearby designated historic resources.
- o Suggested that Performance Measures be included in the Ordinance.
- o Under Performance Measures, include definitions of turnover and vacancy rates.
- o Provide periodic updates to Planning Commission.

This motion carried by the following vote:

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

With respect to requests for building height exceptions, Commissioners were split 3-3 on agreement for a required Super Majority vote and ability to appeal the decision to City Council.

While most Commissioners agreed with the proposed AUD Ordinance, Commissioners Campanella and Bartlett felt that the inclusionary housing requirement should not be applied to the market rate housing allowed under the AUD Ordinance and that the average unit sizes allowed under the Medium-High density tier should be larger.

IV. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

ACTUAL TIME: 5:05 P.M.

D. Committee and Liaison Reports.

1. Staff Hearing Officer Liaison Report

None was given.

2. Other Committee and Liaison Reports

- a. Commissioner Lodge reported on the Historic Landmarks Commission meeting of April 9, 2013.
- b. Commissioner Schwartz reported on the Downtown Parking Committee she attended earlier in the day.

V. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Schwartz adjourned the meeting at 5:08 P.M.

Submitted by,

Julie Rodriguez, Planning Commission Secretary



City of Santa Barbara California

CITY OF SANTA BARBARA PLANNING COMMISSION

RESOLUTION NO. 007-13

CITY-WIDE

RECOMMENDATION TO CITY COUNCIL ON

APRIL 11, 2013

AVERAGE UNIT-SIZE DENSITY INCENTIVE PROGRAM

On April 10, 2012, the City Council initiated amendments to the City's Zoning Ordinance to carry out policies in the Land Use and Housing Elements of the 2011 General Plan pertaining to the implementation of the Average Unit-Size Density Incentive Program. The purpose of the meeting is for the Planning Commission to review and forward recommendations to the City Council concerning adding Chapter 28.20 to the Santa Barbara Municipal Code implementing the Average Unit-Size Density Incentive Program. Amendments to various sections of the Municipal Code are also proposed related to building heights, outdoor living space standards and encroachments in open yards.

The Environmental Analyst has determined that the project is exempt from further environmental review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act Statutes Sections 21083.3 and Guidelines Section 15183.

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

WHEREAS, 6 people appeared to speak in favor of the program, and no one appeared to speak in opposition thereto, and the following exhibits were presented for the record:

1. Staff Report with Attachments, April 4, 2013.
2. Correspondence received in support of the project:
 - a. Lisa Plowman, SB4ALL, Santa Barbara, CA
3. 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 recommendation of the Average Unit-Size Density Incentive Program to City Council making the following recommendations:
 - I. HOUSING TYPES:
 - o Include Average Unit-Size Density Incentive Program definition
 - o Clarify that under Employee Sponsored Housing, each residential unit shall include one person who works on the south coast region of Santa Barbara County.
 - o Clarify language to include that each residential unit is a primary residence for occupants.
 - o Clarify that inclusionary units are not required for employer sponsored housing projects.
 - o Under section D. Employer Sponsored Housing, change language from "must" to "shall" record a written instrument against the real property.
 - o Allow a mix of priority housing types within a project.

- Change Limited-Equity Housing Cooperative to be affordable to households earning ‘up to’ 250% of the Area Medium Income” and specify that it is an entry only requirement.

II. DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS:

a. Setbacks:

- Revise AUD Ordinance to incorporate SB4All recommended text related to front setbacks.

b. Open Space:

- Revise AUD Ordinance to incorporate SB4All recommended text related to outdoor living space.

III. BUILDING HEIGHTS AND FINDINGS:

- Under Building Heights, remove the language “as opposed to purely financial justification”.
- Include and define the term “Livability” in the building Heights and Findings.
- Under Livability, include a reference to the quality of materials and amenities and proximity to goods and services.
- Include definition of “Distinctive”.

IV. REVIEW AND APPROVAL PROCESS:

- Under finding 3 for Community Benefit Projects, change the word “other” to “any” nearby designated historic resources.
- Suggested that Performance Measures be included in the Ordinance.
- Under Performance Measures, include definitions of turnover and vacancy rates.
- Provide periodic updates to Planning Commission.

This motion was passed and adopted on the 11th day of April, 2013 by the Planning Commission of the City of Santa Barbara, by the following vote:

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

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