I. PURPOSE OF HEARING

The applicant is appealing the decision of the Staff Hearing Officer for three requested modifications. Please refer to the appellant’s letter dated January 19, 2015 (Exhibit A).

II. BACKGROUND

On January 6, 2016, the Staff Hearing Officer (SHO) considered a proposal to allow a circular driveway for loading/unloading and uncovered parking in the front setback of an existing residence located at 1417 San Miguel Avenue. Please refer to the SHO Staff Report dated December 21, 2015 (Exhibit B).

The SHO denied the requested Modification to allow an uncovered parking space within the front setback making the finding that the proposal is not consistent with the purposes and intent of the Zoning Ordinance and is not necessary to secure an appropriate improvement on the lot, as the uncovered parking space is inconsistent with the pattern of development within the neighborhood and three conforming parking spaces currently exist onsite (See Exhibit C: SHO Resolution 001-16).

On January 19, 2016, the property owner appealed the SHO’s decision. The appeal letter (Exhibit A) states that the site is unusual in this neighborhood in that the required parking is not at the same level as the house, the garage is detached, and located below the house, and the difference in topography results in hardships for the owners. It further states that various options have been investigated and found to be infeasible for their needs.

III. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The 10,589 square-foot site is currently developed with a 1,513 sq. ft., two-story, single family residence, a detached two-car garage and an uncovered parking space. The proposed project involves a circular driveway and parking/loading space at the front of the house, with a new curb cut and driveway.

IV. REQUIRED APPLICATIONS

The discretionary application required for this project is a Front Setback Modification to allow uncovered parking in the required 20-foot front setback (SBMC §28.15.060 and SBMC §28.92.110).
V. RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission deny the appeal and uphold the SHO’s decision to deny the subject application, making the finding in Section VIII of this report.

VI. SITE INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant:</th>
<th>Don Swann</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property Owner:</td>
<td>Michael and Jami Gott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel Number:</td>
<td>045-132-006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area:</td>
<td>10,589 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Plan:</td>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Max 5 du/acre)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning:</td>
<td>E-3/SD-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Coastal Plan:</td>
<td>Non-Appeal Jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Use:</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topography:</td>
<td>13% Slope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent Land Uses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Single Family Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Single Family Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Single Family Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Single Family Residential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VII. DISCUSSION

The property owners have permanent health issues, which makes loading and unloading vehicles in their approved parking spaces difficult for them. The appeal letter describes the difficulties for the property owners, the unusual nature of the property and neighborhood, and describes the alternatives that they investigated. The property is on the downhill (south) side of San Miguel Avenue, and the existing detached garage is behind and at a lower elevation than the house and is accessed from a driveway that is shared with neighbors to the south.

The applicants have requested the circular driveway and parking space at the front of the house, at the same elevation as the front door and main living level of the house. Their reason for the request is to allow better accessibility to the house, as one of the current residents has permanent injuries from a collision. Currently, the residents must park in either the garage or the uncovered parking space, and climb stairs or sloped surfaces to enter the house, and it is a hardship for them. Their letter states that it is not their intent to permanently park on the circular driveway, but rather to use it for drop-off and pick-up of one of the residents. On-street parking is prohibited on the south side of San Miguel.

The SHO expressed sympathy for the property owners, but stated that because a Modification runs with the land, the uncovered parking/loading space would be in existence far beyond the current necessity. The SHO found that the proposed uncovered parking/loading space in the front setback was neither consistent with the pattern of development within the neighborhood nor with the purpose nor intent of the Zoning Ordinance, and was not an appropriate improvement on the lot. Additionally, the property currently exceeds the parking requirement as it has three parking spaces on the lot.
The concern with circular driveways is that they typically involve the removal of on-street parking and result in parking in the front setback. In this case, parking is not allowed on the south side of the street, so there would be no reduction in on-street parking. In regards to parking within the front setback, the concern relates to aesthetic and neighborhood compatibility, especially when conforming options exist as they do in this case. Although the Single Family Design Board found the modification to be aesthetically appropriate (Exhibit C of the SHO Staff Report), it is not consistent with the pattern of development within this neighborhood and the approval of the Modification would allow the circular driveway and parking spaces for the foreseeable future, and the use of the front setback for parking would far exceed the current parking need.

VIII. RECOMMENDATION AND FINDINGS

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission deny the appeal and uphold the SHO’s decision to deny the subject application, making the finding below:

The Planning Commission finds that the Modification to allow an uncovered parking space within the Front Setback is not consistent with the purposes and intent of the Zoning Ordinance and is not necessary to secure an appropriate improvement on the lot, as the uncovered parking space is inconsistent with the pattern of development within the neighborhood and three conforming parking spaces currently exist onsite.

Exhibits:
A. Applicant's letter, dated January 19, 2016
B. SHO Staff Report, Dated December 21, 2015
C. SHO Resolution 001-16, dated January 6, 2016
D. SHO Minutes, dated January 6, 2016
E. Site Plan
To: City of Santa Barbara Planning Commission

Sub: Appeal of Staff Hearing Officer Decision on 1417 San Miguel Ave (MST2015-0046)

Date of meeting SHO decision was made; 6 January 2016

Description of decision being appealed: “The Staff Hearing Officer finds that the Modification is not consistent with the purposes and intent of the Zoning Ordinance, and is not necessary to secure an appropriate improvement on the lot, as conforming parking currently exists.”

Grounds claimed for appeal: The property is unique in that there is no conforming parking area near the front door to load/unload vehicles. The home is situated on a 14% sloping hill on the south side of San Miguel Ave, between San Rafael and Santa Cruz. Almost every other residence on our side of San Miguel Avenue has a garage facing the street and a driveway in front of it to unload packages before putting the car away in the garage.

There is not anywhere in the front portion of our property to temporarily legally park, and all other parking on the property requires climbing stairs and traversing a steep slope while hauling packages to and from the vehicles, usually making multiple trips to complete the loading/unloading.

Our observation and investigation of other circular driveways with available parking spaces, that are located on the Mesa and in other parts of the City, indicate that they just exist without explanation. There is no mention in the “Scope of Work” on the issued permits relating to parking spaces. Some circular, second driveway approaches, have eliminated parking spaces from the street, other have cars parked in them and some have little to no landscaping to shield from the street. No documentation in the City street files has been found to indicate that Modifications were approved for “Parking in the front setback”.

The original owners mitigated this unique loading/unloading problem by creating an strategic opening in the front hedges and poured a concrete side walk right up to the street, estimated to have been completed in the 1960’s. This opening is strategic in that it is situated directly across from a dual driveway, such that when they parked in the street to load/unload some traffic could squeeze around them. For extended loading/unloading they would drive across the yard to get close to the front door. As such this became the norm, and this is the current loading/unloading process to date. Thus, for decades the owners have loaded/unload while in the “no parking” side of the street or by pulling into the front yard for extended loading/unloading, within the front setback. This has created a situation that means when we use either method to load/unload vehicles near the front door we are in violation of either parking in a posted no-parking zone or parking in the front set-back, it also does not allow us to beautify most of the front yard as the access lane to the front door would be blocked. This method of parking for unloading/loading has safety issues, for in creating a hammerhead condition, the back out area would encounter the existing 14 percent driveway with reduced vision of any neighbor coming up the driveway.

The Staff Hearing Officer identified three parking spaces on the property; two of which are in the garage and one parking location on the side of the recreation room. All three locations require an extended walk up/down the hill to reach the front or rear door. Due to the slope of the property and the original placement of the home, all three parking spaces are behind the front line of the house and significantly

EXHIBIT A
below the level of the home, which negatively impacts our enjoyment of the property and that of the neighborhood, as we are forced to load/unload items in the street or in the front yard.

Temporary parking in front of the garage, which is detached, lower on the hill and at the back end of the property make it difficult to perform tasks such as unloading/loading items or people without an extended walk both to and from the front/rear door. We are forced to either traverse about 75 feet and up 14 stairs to the back door or traverse about 125 feet up the sloped driveway and around the sidewalk to the front door. It also makes it awkward for guests and service personnel if they pull down the shared driveway there is nowhere to park or to turn around, which causes people to back-out of the steep driveway to find street parking. The backing out of the driveway presents a significant safety hazard to pedestrians, not to mention the parked cars across the street, as it is difficult for the best drivers to maneuver at this steep slope and then turn onto the street.

My wife has a permanent condition that makes it painful to carry more than one light item at a time to and from our current parking areas. Her entire right shoulder was replaced and permanent nerve damage was caused due to an automobile accident several years ago. Thus, multiple trips are required if more than one light weight item needs to be carried. Her mitigation is to have me go and unload/load the car, and usually takes me multiple trips as well and I have my own health conditions.

So while unloading, in the front yard in March of 2015, it hit me that if we installed a new driveway approach where the hedge opening is, we could take advantage of the strategic location and enter and exit the street safer and have a place to unload/load items near the front door. This is an optimum location since the driveways across the street keeps people from parking there and makes entry and exiting much safer and easier than the current approach. Compared to where we park to unload in the front yard, this would only require about another ten feet of yard to connect to a new approach. We also provided a landscape plan in order to make the front yard as appealing as possible, with an acceptable landscape buffer from the street partially shielding the driveway/parking space from view, meeting all of the Transportation Dept. view issues and received very positive comments from the Single Family Design Board.

The SHO ruled that the Modification is not consistent with the purposes and intent of the Zoning Ordinance, and is not necessary to secure an appropriate improvement on the lot, as conforming parking currently exists. The City Transportation Dept. generally does not support circular driveways because they usually involve the removal of on-street parking. In our case this would not be an issue. The SHO does acknowledge that this project does not result in the loss of any on-street parking; however, the parking in a front setback is an issue since we have conforming parking on the property.

At the SHO’s suggestion we looked at additional options concerning adding a parking space on the side of the home that is level with the home. This option did not have sufficient space necessary for an additional parking space outside of the front setback, without major renovation to the existing property and home; and would negatively impact the aesthetics of the front yard. The other option was to install a chair-type lift so we could load items and transport them to and from the house. This option would require installing a rail-type transport system across our entire rear/front property, and would destroy the ambiance of our yard.
The determination that our existing parking spaces are conforming, does not address the unique situation of simply being able to load/unload near our front door. It seems that many homes with a garage at the front setback line have their driveway considered “conforming parking” even though it is within the front setback, which provides for off street parking close to their front entry. It seems reasonable that the definition of “conforming” should accommodate safe and ready access to the front door of a single family residence. We are simply asking for the same consideration so we can safely access our front door, enhance the neighborhood and improve our property to enhance our quality of life.

We have contacted Chris Hanson, our local ADA Consultant and his comment was that unfortunately, ADA requirements are voluntary in Residential situations and are not enforceable by any Code.

Finally, the Staff report, noted that the Planning Department is sympathetic to our request because of our situation, and did offer approval findings to the SHO. We therefore are requesting that the Planning Commission approve our appeal.

Please feel free to contact me if any additional questions are necessary.

**Appellant information:**
Michael and Jami Gott; 1417 San Miguel Ave, Santa Barbara, CA 93109; 805-770-7717 (home); Mhgott01@comcast.net

Thank You,

[Signature]
Michael H. Gott
City of Santa Barbara
California

STAFF HEARING OFFICER
STAFF REPORT

REPORT DATE: December 21, 2015
AGENDA DATE: January 6, 2016
PROJECT ADDRESS: 1417 San Miguel Avenue (MST2015-00426)
TO: Susan Reardon, Senior Planner, Staff Hearing Officer
FROM: Planning Division, (805) 564-5470
Danny Kato, Senior Planner

I. PROJECT DESCRIPTION
The 10,589 square-foot site is currently developed with a 1,513 sq. ft., two-story, single family residence, a detached two-car garage and uncovered parking space. The proposed project involves a circular driveway and parking space at the front of the house, with a new curb cut and driveway. The discretionary application required for this project is a Front Setback Modification to allow uncovered parking in the required 20-foot front setback (SBMC §28.15.060 and SBMC §28.92.110).

Date Application Accepted: November 10, 2015  Date Action Required: January 10, 2015

II. RECOMMENDATION
Staff recommends that the Staff Hearing Officer deny the Front Setback Modification.

III. SITE INFORMATION AND PROJECT STATISTICS
A. SITE INFORMATION
Applicant: Don Swann
Parcel Number: 045-132-006
General Plan: Low Density Residential (Max 5 du/acre)
Existing Use: Residential
Adjacent Land Uses:
   North – Single Family Residence
   South – Single Family Residence
Property Owner: Michael and Jami Gott
Lot Area: 10,589 sq. ft.
Zoning: E-3
Topography: 13% Slope

EXHIBIT B
IV. DISCUSSION

The project was reviewed by the SFDB on September 21, 2015, and found that the proposed Modification was aesthetically appropriate, and that it did not pose any issues with the design guidelines.

The proposed project involves the construction of a new circular driveway in the front setback of an existing house. The property is on the downhill (south) side of San Miguel Avenue, and the existing, detached garage is behind and at a lower elevation than the house. The garage is accessed from a driveway that is shared with neighbors to the south. The applicants have requested the circular driveway and parking space at the front of the house, at the same elevation as the front door and main living level of the house. Their reason for the request is to allow better accessibility to the house, as one of the current residents has permanent injuries from a collision. Currently, the residents must park in either the garage or the uncovered parking space, and climb stairs or sloped surfaces to enter the house, and it is a hardship for them. Their letter states that it is not their intent to permanently park on the circular driveway, but rather to use it for drop-off and pick-up of one of the residents. On-street parking is prohibited on the south side of San Miguel.

Staff does not generally support circular driveways because they usually involve the removal of on-street parking, and because they usually result in parking in front setbacks. In this case, parking is not allowed on the south side of the street, so there would be no reduction in on-street parking. Staff does not generally support parking in front setbacks, primarily for aesthetic reasons, especially when conforming options exist, as they do in this case. Although Staff is sympathetic to the current residents’ need, the approval of the Modification would allow the circular driveway and parking spaces for the foreseeable future, and the use of the front setback for parking would far exceed the current need; therefore, Staff does not support the request. However, the SFDB found the driveway to be aesthetically appropriate, and if the Staff Hearing Officer is inclined to grant the requested Front Setback Modifications, approval findings are included below.

V. FINDINGS AND CONDITIONS

DENIAL FINDINGS

The Staff Hearing Officer finds that the Modification is not consistent with the purposes and intent of the Zoning Ordinance, and is not necessary to secure an appropriate improvement on the lot, as conforming parking currently exists.

APPROVAL FINDINGS

The Staff Hearing Officer finds that the Modification is consistent with the purposes and intent of the Zoning Ordinance and is necessary to secure an appropriate improvement on the lot. The proposed circular driveway and parking spaces are appropriate because they provide easy access to the main level of the house, are aesthetically appropriate, and are not anticipated to adversely impact the adjacent neighbors or openness from the street.
Exhibits:
A. Site Plan (under separate cover)
B. Applicant's letter, dated September 22, 2015
C. SFDB Minutes, dated September 21, 2015

Contact/Case Planner: Danny Kato, Senior Planner
(DKato@SantaBarbaraCA.gov)
630 Garden Street, Santa Barbara, CA 93101
Phone: (805) 564-5470 x2567
September 22, 2015

Staff Hearing Officer  
City of Santa Barbara  
P.O. Box 1990  
Santa Barbara, CA 93102-1990

Re: Modification Request for Michael and Jami Gott, 1417 San Miguel Ave., Santa Barbara, CA, 93109  
APN: 045-132-006, E-3/SD-3 Land Use Zone

Dear Staff Hearing Officer:

The existing two story residence (1,513 sf.) has an existing, originally attached 5 ft. by 20 ft. covered front porch that encroaches 5 ft. into the front building setback. A detached, 2 car garage, (440 sf.), is located at rear of the property and encroaches one foot into the required 6 foot south, interior, rear yard setback. Both structures were built with permits. An attached covered deck (BLD2015-01741) is currently in the permitting process and will be issued shortly.
The existing property is 10,589 sf., with a rear yard open space of 1,848 square feet. The Gott residence is located on the downhill side of San Miguel Ave., and the street is posted “No Parking” on the south, their side of the street, complicating easy access to their home. Parking is provided on the north side of the street, but not always available, because of the large amount of vehicles in the neighborhood. Their existing driveway enters from the street, down the slope to the south, along the westerly side of the property, to the garage at the rear, and then continuing on for two more neighboring properties below.

We are proposing to add a much needed, modified circular driveway in the front yard of the above property, with new a 12ft. wide driveway apron, new colored, stamped concrete drive, connecting to the existing driveway, and then on to the new, to be redone 17 ft. wide concrete driveway apron at the street.

New landscaping is proposed, per the latest City Standards, with acceptable approved street trees that will allow more visibility to the street from the existing sloping, driveway, but is also designed to provide visual screening for the new driveway/parking space in the front yard from the street.
The Project was submitted to the SFDB and received favorable comments on Sept. 21, 2015. Chelsey Swanson of the City Transportation Dept. has reviewed and accepted the new driveway layout as submitted.

The purpose of this driveway is to allow Mrs. Gott to exit a vehicle near the front door, (only entrance to the main floor living level, without stairs) and enter her home at the street level as described in her letter, dated April 14, 2015, attached.
The property has ample vehicle parking, with a two car garage and an additional two other areas, outside the required setbacks, where cars can park. The new turnaround in front is mainly for Mrs. Gott’s accessibility.
Presently when a vehicle exits the driveway, extreme caution is necessary for safe egress to the roadway. The new, front landscaping is designed to alleviate a great portion of this visibility, especially to the east, but unfortunately the vegetation to the west on the adjacent property, near the street, will still hinder some line of sight of the street in that direction.

The modification requested is .......To allow an open parking space be located within the front building setback line. Although this is the formal request, it is not the owner’s intent to use this new driveway as a permanent parking space.

The improvements shown on the plans are designed to improve the livability of the Owner’s home and the necessity for a much needed access to their home.

In the submittal package, there are several photos of existing residences that have circular driveways with two driveway aprons and “Parking” areas within the front setback, in the City of Santa Barbara. Some with lesser restrictive conditions that we have encountered, and most, if not all did not require a modification for an “Open Parking Space” within the front building setback, and/or are not mentioned in the Building Permits on file. Public Works Counter staff indicated that verification of all the two driveway aprons permits shown in the photos of our submittal will be difficult for they are not in computer files for easy access.

Whatever other residences in Santa Barbara have, these new improvements will enhance the look of the Gott’s property and will not incur any hardships or be incompatible with the surrounding neighborhood.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Don Swann
Agent for Michael and Jami Gott, Owners

ENCLOSURE: LETTER DATED APRIL 14, 2015 TO BRENDA BELTZ
April, 24, 2015

Ms. Brenda Beltz
City of Santa Barbara,
Community Development Department
Planning Division
630 Garden St.
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

Subject: Proposed circular drive access to our home located at 1417 San Miguel Ave.,
Santa Barbara, CA, 93109

Dear Ms. Beltz,

My husband and I are retiring and presently in the process of moving to our home in Santa Barbara that we have owned for many years. Our three kids were born and raised in the area, and have three grandkids in Santa Barbara along with the many friends we have developed over the years.

The house is located on the downhill side of San Miguel Ave., a narrow street, posted “No Parking” on our side. There closest parking to our front door is on the other side of the street facing the other way, but rarely available. We have ample parking on our property with a detached two car garage and two other areas for parking vehicles. However, because all the on-property parking is, on the slope, below and detached from the main house, it makes it difficult for me to walk up/down-hill, the many steps from the garage up to the house, with any type of bags. The situation makes it extremely difficult to unload people/groceries near our front door.

In addition, we would like to repair the existing approach so it is easier to enter and leave the driveway, onto San Miguel Ave, due to the parked cars and narrowness of the entire street. This means that all three of the home owners that share the driveway must usually drive over the curb edge of the existing approach upon entry and exit, in order to avoid the parked cars across the street.

I received a debilitating impairment many years ago in a tragic car accident, where in addition to my youngest son being killed, my shoulder had to be reconstructed, broke my back and have permanent nerve damage in my right arm, which has restricted my mobility. Unfortunately, my condition has only gotten worse with age; therefore, we are requesting the circular drive so I can exit the car near the front door for unloading/loading of myself and packages. My husband will then put the car away in the detached garage down below the house.

Don Swann, our designer, has reviewed and received positive responses from the City’s Transportation engineer and Field inspector for the approaches and directional flow for the drive, but will be formally applying with your Pre-Case approval.

Sincerely,

Jami Gott
NEW ITEM: PUBLIC HEARING

B. 1417 SAN MIGUEL AVE

Assessor’s Parcel Number: 045-132-006
Application Number: MST2015-00426
Owner: Gott Family Trust
Designer: Don Swann

(E-3/SD-3 Zone)

(Proposal for a new circular driveway and new landscaping in the front yard of an existing single-family residence in the non-appealable jurisdiction of the Coastal Zone. The project includes Staff Hearing Officer review for one uncovered parking space within the front setback.)

(Comments only; project requires environmental assessment and Staff Hearing Officer review for a requested zoning modification.)

Continued to Staff Hearing Officer to return to Consent with comments:
1) The Board finds the requested zoning modification aesthetically appropriate and does not pose consistency issues with the design guidelines.
CITY OF SANTA BARBARA STAFF HEARING OFFICER
RESOLUTION NO. 001-16
1417 SAN MIGUEL AVENUE
FRONT SETBACK MODIFICATION
JANUARY 6, 2016

APPLICATION OF DON SWANN DESIGNER FOR MICHAEL AND JAMI GOTT, 1417 SAN MIGUEL AVENUE, APN: 045-132-006, E-3/SD-3 (ONE FAMILY RESIDENCE/COASTAL) ZONES, GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (MAX. 5 DU/ACRE) (MST2015-00426)

The 10,589 square-foot site is currently developed with a 1,513 sq. ft., two-story, single family residence, a detached two-car garage and uncovered parking space. The proposed project involves a circular driveway and parking space at the front of the house, with a new curb cut and driveway. The discretionary application required for this project is a Front Setback Modification to allow uncovered parking in the required 20-foot front setback (SBMC §28.15.060 and SBMC §28.92.110).

The Environmental Analyst has determined that the project is exempt from further environmental review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines Section 15301 and 15305 (Existing Facilities and Minor Alterations to Land Use Limitations).

WHEREAS, the Staff Hearing Officer has held the required public hearing on the above application, and the Applicant was present.

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

1. Staff Report with Attachments, Decembe, 21 2015
2. Site Plans

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the City Staff Hearing Officer denied the subject application making the finding and determination that the Modification to allow an uncovered parking space within the Front Setback is not consistent with the purposes and intent of the Zoning Ordinance and is not necessary to secure an appropriate improvement on the lot, as the uncovered parking space is inconsistent with the pattern of development within the neighborhood and three conforming parking spaces currently exist onsite.

EXHIBIT C
This motion was passed and adopted on the 6th day of January 6, 2016 by the Staff Hearing Officer of the City of Santa Barbara.

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

Julie Rodriguez, Planning Commission Secretary

Date

PLEASE BE ADVISED:

1. This action of the Staff Hearing Officer can be appealed to the Planning Commission or the City Council within ten (10) days after the date the action was taken by the Staff Hearing Officer.
II. PROJECTS:

ACTUAL TIME: 9:01 A.M.


The 10,589 square-foot site is currently developed with a 1,513 sq. ft., two-story, single family residence, a detached two-car garage and uncovered parking space. The proposed project involves a circular driveway and parking space at the front of the house, with a new curb cut and driveway. The discretionary application required for this project is a Front Setback Modification to allow uncovered parking in the required 20-foot front setback (SBMC §28.15.060 and SBMC §28.92.110).

The Environmental Analyst has determined that the project is exempt from further environmental review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines Section 15301 and 15305 (Existing Facilities and Minor Alterations to Land Use Limitations).

Case Planner: Danny Kato, Senior Planner
Email: DKato@SantaBarbaraCA.gov Phone: (805) 564-5470, ext. 2567.

Present: Don Swann, Designer; and Michael Gott, Owner.

Ms. Reardon announced that she read the Staff Report for the proposed project and also visited the site and surrounding neighborhood.

Danny Kato, Senior Planner, gave the Staff presentation and recommendation.

The Public Hearing was opened at 9:17 a.m.; and, with no one wishing to speak, the Public Hearing was closed.

ACTION: Assigned Resolution No. 001-16
Denied the Front Setback Modification making the denial findings as outlined in the Staff Report dated December 21, 2015, and as revised at the hearing.

The ten calendar day appeal period to the Planning Commission was announced and is subject to suspension for review by the Planning Commission.

EXHIBIT D