



City of Santa Barbara
PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES
AUGUST 10, 2017

1:00 P.M.
City Hall, Council Chambers
735 Anacapa Street
SantaBarbaraCA.gov

COMMISSION MEMBERS:

Jay D. Higgins, *Chair*
Lesley Wiscomb, *Vice Chair*
John P. Campanella
Mike Jordan
Sheila Lodge
Deborah L. Schwartz
Addison Thompson

STAFF:

N. Scott Vincent, Assistant City Attorney
Beatriz Gularte, Senior Planner
Kathleen Goo, Commission Secretary

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Higgins called the meeting to order at 1:02 p.m.

I. ROLL CALL

Chair Jay D. Higgins, Vice Chair Lesley Wiscomb, Commissioners John P. Campanella, Mike Jordan, Sheila Lodge, and Addison Thompson

Absent: Deborah L. Schwartz

STAFF PRESENT

N. Scott Vincent, Assistant City Attorney
Beatriz Gularte, Senior Planner
Dan Gullett, Supervising Transportation Planner
Andrew Bermond, Project Planner
Jessica W. Grant, Project Planner
Barbara Shelton, Project Planner/Environmental Analyst
Kathleen Goo, Commission Secretary

II. PRELIMINARY MATTERS

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

No requests.

B. Announcements and appeals:

No announcements.

- C. Review, consideration, and action on the following draft Planning Commission minutes and resolutions:

1. July 6, 2017

MOTION: Campanella/Thompson

Continue the July 6, 2017 Planning Commission Draft Minutes for further edits.

This motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 6 Noes: 0 Abstain: 0 Absent: 1

2. PC Resolution No. 012-17
214-226 De La Guerra St.

MOTION: Wiscomb/Jordan

Approve Resolution No. 012-17 as presented.

This motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 6 Noes: 0 Abstain: 0 Absent: 1

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

No public comment.

III. CONTINUED ITEM

ACTUAL TIME: 1:07 P.M.

FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT (EIR) FOR THE PROPOSED SANTA BARBARA AIRPORT MASTER PLAN

Staff will present and recommend certification of the Final EIR for the Santa Barbara Airport Master Plan by the Planning Commission, and recommend adoption of the Airport Master Plan to the City Council.

The Santa Barbara Airport Master Plan (Master Plan) would provide guidance for airport facility improvements for the next 15-20 years. The proposed Master Plan relies on Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)-approved forecasted estimates of future aviation activity at the Santa Barbara Airport (Airport) and identifies improvement projects to support short term, intermediate term (2022) and long term (2032) levels of airport activity. The development projects are not only reflective of the level of activity forecasted to occur at the Airport, but are dependent on federal funding cycles and the availability of grant money for aviation projects.

The proposed Airport Master Plan facility improvement projects include:

- Airfield Recommendations: Extension of Taxiway H to the west, parallel to the main runway, restriping of existing paved areas, paving light lanes along taxiway edges, and relocating entrances and exits from the taxiway system to comply with Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) recommendations.

- North Landside Recommendations: Consolidation of general aviation operations to facilitate two Fixed Base Operator (FBO) lease areas on the northeast portion of the airfield to provide tenant and visiting private aircraft services and facilities, and support facility changes including the relocation of the Airport Maintenance Yard.
- Terminal Area Recommendations: Construction of a new Long Term Parking Lot south of the Airline Terminal to accommodate 1,315 new or relocated parking spaces, expansion of the Airline Terminal, and relocation of the south-side FBO.

Action to be considered by the Planning Commission: Certification of the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Santa Barbara Airport Master Plan (SCH#2014061096) (CEQA Guidelines §15090).

Recommendations to the City Council to be considered by the Planning Commission:

- A. A Statement of Overriding Considerations for contributions to a cumulative impact to peak-hour traffic at Kellogg and Hollister Avenues in the intermediate term (Impact T-2) and for contributions to cumulative impacts to peak-hour traffic at Kellogg and Hollister Avenues and Fairview Avenue and US Highway 101 Northbound Ramps in the long term (Impact T-3) (CEQA Guidelines §15093).;
- B. Adoption of the Santa Barbara Airport Master Plan dated July 2017 (City Charter §806(a));
- C. An amendment to the Airport Industrial Area Specific Plan (SP-6) removing Sub-Area 1 (City Charter §806(a));
- D. An amendment to the Airport Zoning Map; and
- E. A Local Coastal Plan amendment to the Airport and Goleta Slough Local Coastal Plan Zoning Map (City Charter §806(a)).

The EIR analyzed effects associated with air quality/greenhouse gas emissions, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils/ hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, public utilities (solid waste disposal), and transportation/traffic, and proposed mitigation measures to reduce the severity of effects.

Contact: Andrew Bermond, Project Planner
Email: ABermond@SantaBarbaraCA.gov

Phone: (805) 692-6032

Andrew Bermond, Project Planner, gave the Staff presentation.

Hazel Johns, Airport Director, and Tracy Lincoln, Operation Manager gave the Applicant presentation, and was joined by Jim Harris for Koffman & Associates.

Public comment opened at 1:41 p.m.

The following people spoke in support:

1. Steven A. Amerikaner, Attorney
2. Julie Broderick for Signature Flight Support
3. Karen Kahn, Santa Barbara Airport Commission
4. Carl Hopkins
5. Gordon Feingold

The following people spoke in opposition or with concerns:

1. Alex Bennet spoke of concerns regarding Airport not being prepared for rising sea levels.

2. Pat Saley, Goleta Slough Management Committee, had concerns regarding policy consistency for the Taxiway H in the Staff Report (page 24), the rezone, and findings to be made.
3. Marti Milan, City of Goleta, Principal Civil Engineer, read into the record the City of Goleta's written concerns regarding the Airport Master Plan; EIR compliance with CEQA requirements, including payment for traffic peak hour fees; incorrect baseline; and inadequate required mitigation of the Master Plan to the City of Goleta (TMM-1).
4. Jessie Altstatt, Santa Barbara Audubon Society, recommended a more environmentally friendly and less expensive preferred alternative for dealing with "hot spots"; the lack of proper biological and ecological studies; concerns regarding EIR impacts to wildlife habitats and resulting low-quality habitats; and Goleta Slough preservation and rising sea level.
5. Mark Holmgren, local biologist, had concerns regarding EIR impacts to wildlife habitat and loss of value and additional cost to the public; lack of proper resource evaluation to implement the Airport Master Plan; lack of proper mitigation of habitat areas near Taxiway H; Goleta Slough rising sea level; and lack of proper biological studies and subsequent impacts to fragile native estuary habitats.

Public comment closed at 2:03 p.m.

Mr. Vincent clarified issues of consistencies with CEQA regarding the EIR and Master Plan. He explained that past mitigation for improvements are not relevant to the current EIR, and the prior baseline may be outdated or not relevant for the current EIR environmental setting because it is based on the improvements and operations of the Santa Barbara Airport as of April 2015. Consistent with CEQA's definition of the environmental setting, and consistent with typical application of CEQA, the environmental setting and baseline is at the time of preparation of the EIR.

According to Ms. Milan, the City of Goleta's concern is that the baseline assumes the original Master Plan contained requirements that were never complied with in the prior EIRs, agreements did not exist, and mitigations were not paid to the City of Goleta. The current EIR assumes the traffic that exists today has been mitigated yet does not address it (e.g., Stork and Hollister Streets intersection improvements). The City of Goleta seeks reimbursement from the Santa Barbara Airport based upon the City of Goleta's transportation impact program mitigation schedule or "GTIP fees" for peak hour trips generated by the airport project, to help provide needed improvement projects within the City of Goleta.

Mr. Vincent clarified the distinction between application of GTIP fees and the question of adequate mitigation under CEQA. The EIR identified potentially significant impacts, and if feasible mitigations do not mitigate the impacts to a level of less than significant, then overriding considerations must be made before approval and certification of the project. The main issue is that if the City of Santa Barbara were to pay GTIP fees as recommended (by the City of Goleta), those fees would contribute to the impacted intersections identified in the EIR, but would also contribute to other transportation-related improvements identified in the Goleta Transportation Improvement Program, and those intersections or programs are not projects that are mitigating impacts created by the Master Plan build-out. The suggestion by the City of Goleta to pay GTIP fees demonstrates that the City of Goleta and the Airport are not in agreement as to which projects are necessary to mitigate the impacts identified in the EIR. "Significant" impacts must be identified as opposed to "insignificant" impacts.

Mr. Bermond explained that overriding considerations would involve applying a fair-share contribution, cost allocation per project when a traffic study demonstrates peak hour trip contributions to impacted intersections.

In response to Commissioner Campanella's question about why findings for overriding conditions are needed for traffic impacts, Ms. Shelton noted that, although full mitigation for traffic impacts is identified, the mitigations and authority to mitigate are within another government jurisdiction, such that the City of Santa Barbara cannot assure the implementation, timing, and feasibility of the mitigation. The impact is therefore identified as potentially significant, triggering the need for overriding considerations. Generally, full credit for traffic improvement mitigations is only given in EIRs when the improvements are approved, funded, and scheduled.

Commission comments:

Commissioner Thompson expressed support for the Airport Master Plan and EIR; however, he pointed out that under consideration is an Airport Plan, not a wildlife sanctuary plan. He stated that, as a lifelong outdoorsman, he appreciates and supports efforts to take care of the area's wildlife. But, as a retired professional pilot, he recognizes that birds and aircraft do not mix well together and cited examples of serious air accidents caused by bird strikes. He stated that we should all remain cognizant of the unintended safety consequences of making the airport area favorable to wildlife. The Airport Master Plan as proposed is a good plan and necessary to enhance safety and the efficiency of operations at the Santa Barbara Airport.

Commissioner Jordan concurred with Commissioner Thompson, and stated he was satisfied that concerns have been adequately balanced with the need for an essential operation in the City with locations placed long ago on available land. The usual exemplary mitigation has been accomplished to balance the needs for a functioning airport and for wildlife habitat. He supported Certification of the Final EIR for the Airport Master Plan and recommendation to City Council.

Commissioner Wiscomb stated that the previous Master Plan had comprehensive guiding principles for safety and has responded very well as an excellent guiding document over the years. She concluded that the benefits of the Airport Master Plan outweigh the significant traffic impacts, and supported Certification of the Final EIR for the Airport Master Plan and recommendation to City Council.

Commissioner Campanella also expressed appreciation to staff and consultants for the comprehensive document as a foundation for further environmental analysis for future projects, and that safety is a continuing concern for certain locations for increased businesses, traffic, and private planes at the airport. He found the current Airport Master Plan a great improvement over previous versions, and found the mitigation is well considered and the Airport Master Plan will enhance what is already currently in place. He supported Certification of the Final EIR for the Airport Master Plan and recommendation to City Council.

Commissioner Lodge concurred with the Commission's comments and felt the land use is necessary, despite the fact that the Santa Barbara Airport has an unfortunate location near wildlife habitats; however, she supported Certification of the Final EIR for the Airport Master Plan and recommendation to City Council.

Chair Higgins shares the Commission's and public's concern for land use and protection of wildlife habitats, but supported Certification of the Final EIR for the Airport Master Plan and recommendation to City Council.

MOTION: Thompson/Jordan

Assigned Resolution No. 013-17

Certify the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Santa Barbara Airport Master Plan, with the findings in the Staff Report and the format revisions, and made the following recommendations to the City Council:

- A. A Statement of Overriding Considerations for contributions to a cumulative impact to peak-hour traffic at Kellogg and Hollister Avenues in the intermediate term (Impact T-2) and for contributions to cumulative impacts to peak-hour traffic at Kellogg and Hollister Avenues and Fairview Avenue and US Highway 101 Northbound Ramps in the long term (Impact T-3);
- B. Adoption of the Santa Barbara Airport Master Plan dated July 2017;
- C. An amendment to the Airport Industrial Area Specific Plan (SP-6) removing Sub-Area 1);
- D. An amendment to the Airport Zoning Map; and
- E. A Local Coastal Plan amendment to the Airport and Goleta Slough Local Coastal Plan Zoning Map.

This motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 6 Noes: 0 Abstain: 0 Absent: 1

The ten calendar day appeal period was announced.

*** THE COMMISSION RECESSED FROM 3:00 TO 3:15 P.M. ***

IV. NEW ITEM

ACTUAL TIME: 3:15 P.M.

APPLICATION OF THOMAS OCHSNER, ARCHITECT FOR CHAD YONKER, PROPERTY OWNER, 1631 SHORELINE DRIVE, APN 045-173-022, E-3/SD-3 SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL AND COASTAL OVERLAY ZONES, GENERAL PLAN/LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM LAND USE PLAN DESIGNATION: FIVE RESIDENTIAL UNITS PER ACRE (MST2016-00241/CDP2017-00002)

The project consists of a major home remodel resulting in a first-story addition of 422 square feet and a new 1,356 square foot second-story addition to an existing one-story, 1,826 square foot single-family residence, and 382 square foot garage. Other proposed site improvements include landscape changes, a new wood fence, new plaster wall, a new concrete driveway, and a flagstone patio. Code violations in ZIR2016-00169 and ENF2008-00161 will be addressed with the project. The applicant is requesting permission to permit the two "as-built" retaining walls and chain link fence and remove the concrete pad. The proposed total of 3,986 square feet on a 20,100 square foot lot located in the Hillside Design District is 85% of the guideline maximum floor-to-lot-area ratio (FAR).

The property is zoned E-3/SD-3, Single Family and is located in the Appealable Jurisdiction of the Coastal Zone with a General Plan and Coastal Land Use designation of Residential, Five Dwelling Units per Acre.

The subject site is a south-facing bluff-face property with the existing main residential structure north of the edge of the coastal bluff. The existing drainage is via two drain inlets on the southern portion of the bluff that drain down to the beach. The project site would comply with Tier 3 Storm Water Management.

The discretionary application required for this project is a Coastal Development Permit (CDP2017-00002) to allow the proposed development in the Appealable Jurisdiction of the City's Coastal Zone (SBMC §28.44.060). The project requires an environmental finding pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines Section 15183.

Contact: Jessica Grant, Project Planner
Email: JGrant@SantaBarbaraCA.gov

Phone: (805) 564-5470, ext. 4550

Jessica Grant, Project Planner, gave the Staff presentation.

Thomas Ochsner, Architect, gave the Applicant presentation, and was joined by Jason Godsick, Civil Engineer; Adam Simmons, Geologist; and Charles McClure, Landcape Architect.

Public comment opened at 3:36 p.m.

The following people spoke in opposition or with concerns:

1. Jesse Wooten (submitted neighbors' letters and photographs) spoke of blocked private views towards Santa Cruz islands by the proposed house, surrounding de-valued property without good neighbor considerations, and claimed lack of noticing from the City.
2. Kit Fulbeck (submitted a letter and photographs) spoke of loss of private views, lowered property values, lack of neighborhood preservation of private views, and claimed lack of noticing from the City.
3. Jon Kauffman (submitted a letter and photographs) spoke of the proposed two-story house blocking his private views, and claimed lack of noticing from the City.

Public comment closed at 3:58 p.m.

Commissioner comments:

Commissioner Wiscomb expressed concern that it appeared that some neighbors were not noticed and recommended continuation to Single Family Design Board (SFDB). She preferred that the Applicant find out if another alternative solution to remove the retaining walls would be possible.

Commissioner Jordan concurred with Commissioner Wiscomb and expressed concern that the yellow posting notice was not in place during the site visit and disappeared from the site. He stated he was not impressed with the public argument of neighbors for preservation of private views, but understood the argument that neighbors did not get the opportunity to express their opinions and comments. He found the project did not have enough substantiation for a Planning Commission approval, especially regarding claims of lack of noticing, disappearing site notice, and lack of SFDB neighborhood compatibility findings. Possibilities may exist to leave the existing grade alone and not disturb the bluff-top habitat for better stability or to remove everything and bring everything back to grade. He would like to see design review address the merits of these options as part of the decision.

Commissioner Thompson expressed concern that some neighbors were not noticed and made aware of the previous design review meetings, and would like staff to research the 300-foot noticing radius against the distance of concerned neighbors. He suggested the option to leave the retaining walls, take off the top two feet, and re-contour by packing in the soil around the bottom, and leave in the bottom part of the retaining walls for more stability. He is aware that SFDB does not have purview of preservation of private views, only City public view corridors, but he would be surprised if the SFDB made changes based upon private view concerns. However, he would support a return to SFDB or even support allowing the project to move forward.

Ms. Grant confirmed with a Google Earth photograph that the yellow posting notice was placed on the project site.

Commissioner Lodge concurred with Commissioners Jordan and Thompson. She would like the project to return to SFDB, and a good neighbor policy compatibility finding could be made with less impact on the neighbors and for alternative solutions on the bluff face.

Commissioner Campanella requested that prior to the project's return to the Commission, he would like the Planning Commission's purview defined under the Coastal Development Permit regarding public views and private views, i.e., whether private views are a consideration or not when determining the findings for a Coastal Development Permit. He stated that the Commission makes the findings under Coastal Development Permits, and not necessarily for "good neighbor policy" as the Single Family Design Board does.

Mr. Vincent recommended to amend the motion for proper noticing to property owners and tenants within 300 feet, and any identified interested parties, with proper posting of yellow posting notice.

Commissioner Wiscomb concurred with Commissioner Thompson and supported including in the motion the option to reduce the size and bury the retaining wall for stability and support.

Chair Higgins found the work done on the project to be acceptable, and stated he wasn't concerned with the proposed solution for the retaining wall to be shaved off by a couple feet and that leaving it in place would be a remedial improvement; however, he found the large size of the project to be a concern with neighbors and spoke of concerns and a request for the Single Family Design Board to review the style and placement of windows on the east and west and placement for privacy impacts, the accuracy of story poles from the photographs provided by neighbors, to reconsider whether the stairways are to remain or be removed.

Commissioner Jordan addressed the issue of the stairs, and stated he was not against what exists on the project now as a final result, but the history of the site involved a blatant disregard by the previous owner (not a fault of the current owner) of the parcel's usable space and continued plateaus of the bluff top. It would be short-sighted to just leave what is there alone, put in some landscaping, and expect a better result. He could support for bluff stability restricting what is there now if there were assurances to restrict the use of the plateaus.

Mr. Vincent clarified that his recommendation would be that new development should assure structure integrity of the bluff face and recommended an indefinite continuance to address issues

of neighborhood compatibility to satisfy the findings for the Coastal Development Permit that were not addressed at the time the of design review.

To reduce existing impacts to the bluff top, three redesign solutions were suggested for inaccessibility and non-use for the bluff top:

- a. Remove the retaining wall entirely and bring in fill-dirt to blend with the bluff top; or
- b. Leave the retaining wall as is, remove 2 feet off the top of the retaining wall, and back-fill behind the retaining wall with fill or landscaping; or
- c. Bury the retaining wall, remove two feet off the top of the retaining wall, step it down, and back-fill.

MOTION: Lodge/Wiscomb

Continued indefinitely to the Single Family Design Board for a noticed concept hearing to tenants and owners within 300 feet of the project and identified interested parties, and for the SFDB to:

1. Reconsider the style of windows on the east and west and their placement for privacy impacts; and
2. Restudy the accuracy of story poles from the photographs provided by neighbors, and consider their concerns.

And for the Applicant to study alternative re-design solutions for inaccessibility and non-use to reduce existing impacts to the bluff top, as follows:

1. Remove the retaining wall entirely and bring in fill-dirt to blend with the bluff top; or
2. Leave the retaining wall as is, remove 2 feet off the top of the retaining wall, and back-fill behind the retaining wall with fill or landscaping; or
3. Bury the retaining wall, remove two feet off the top of the retaining wall, step it down, and back-fill.

This motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 6 Noes: 0 Abstain: 0 Absent: 1

ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

ACTUAL TIME: 5:00 P.M.

A. Committee and Liaison Reports:

1. Staff Hearing Officer Liaison Report

No report.

2. Other Committee and Liaison Reports

- a. Commissioner Lodge reported on the HLC meetings of July 26, 2017 and August 9, 2017.
- c. Commissioner Campanella reported on the July Housing Task Force meeting.

V. **ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Higgins adjourned the meeting at 5:04 p.m.

Submitted by,



Kathleen Goo, Commission Secretary