



City of Santa Barbara
PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES
MAY 10, 2018

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

COMMISSION MEMBERS:

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

STAFF:

N. Scott Vincent, Assistant City Attorney
 Beatriz Gularte, Senior Planner
 Krystal M. Vaughn, Commission Secretary

CALL TO ORDER

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

I. ROLL CALL

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

STAFF PRESENT

N. Scott Vincent, Assistant City Attorney
 Beatriz Gularte, Senior Planner
 Irma Unzueta, Senior Planner
 Dan Gullett, Supervising Transportation Planner
 Kathleen Kennedy, Associate Planner
 Michelle Bedard, Assistant Planner
 Andrew Perez, Assistant Transportation Planner
 Krystal M. Vaughn, Commission Secretary

II. PRELIMINARY MATTERS

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

No requests.

B. Announcements and appeals:

Ms. Gularte announced that the appeal on the Planning Commission action to uphold the decision of the Staff Hearing Officer with regard to the dispensary permit at 118 N. Milpas has been withdrawn.

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

No public comment.

III. **NEW ITEM**

A. **ACTUAL TIME: 1:03 P.M.**

APPLICATION OF LAURA BRIDLEY, APPLICANT FOR PHILIP K. BATES III, PROPERTY OWNER, 408 N HOPE AVE, APN 053-430-064, RS-7.5/USS ZONES, GENERAL PLAN LAND USE PLAN DESIGNATION: LOW RESIDENTIAL, MAX 5 DU/AC (MST2017-00097)

The project consists of the subdivision of an existing 0.65 acre (28,427 square feet.) residential parcel into two lots, located in the Low Density Residential (5 du/ac) General Plan Designation and Single Residential (RS-7.5/USS) Zone. Proposed Lot 1 will be 0.43 acre (18,788 square feet) and Lot 2 is proposed to be 0.22 acre (9,639 square feet). Proposed Lot 1 includes the existing single-residential dwelling, carport and accessory buildings that will be maintained. Proposed Lot 2 is vacant and does not include development of a residential unit at this time. The existing parcel is a flag lot and currently provides access for two existing lots fronting North Hope Avenue. With the proposed subdivision the private driveway will provide access to a total of four lots. The physical changes associated with the subdivision include public accessibility improvements within the public right-of-way to meet city standards, and establishing new utility (sewer) connections. Water service is provided by Lincolnwood Mutual Water Company, a private water company, and is not served by City Water.

The discretionary applications required for this project are:

1. A Tentative Subdivision Map to allow the division of one 0.65 acre (28,427 square feet) parcel into two lots (SBMC Chapter §27.07);
2. A Street Frontage Modification to allow proposed Lot 1 without street frontage (SBMC §30.20.030, and SBMC §30.250.020.B);
3. A Street Frontage Modification to allow proposed Lot 2 without the minimum 60-foot public street frontage requirements (SBMC §30.20.030, and SBMC §30.250.020.B);
4. A Public Street Waiver to allow a subdivision creating lots without public street frontage to be served by a private driveway (access easement), which serves more than two lots (SBMC §22.60.300).

The Environmental Analyst has determined that the project is exempt from further environmental review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines Section 15315 (Minor Land Divisions).

Michelle Bedard, Assistant Planner, gave the Staff presentation.

Laura Bridley, gave the Applicant presentation.

Public comment opened at 1:25 p.m., and as no one wished to speak, it closed.

MOTION: Schwartz/Jordan**Assigned Resolution No. 012-18**

Approve the project, making the findings for the Tentative Subdivision Map, Street Frontage Modifications and a Public Street Waiver as outlined in the Staff Report dated May 3, 2018, subject to the Conditions of Approval as outlined in the Staff Report, with the following revisions to the Conditions of Approval: Remove Item D, Design Review requirements.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 7 Noes: 0 Abstain: 0 Absent: 0

*** THE COMMISSION RECESSED FROM 1:28 TO 1:43 P.M. ***

The ten calendar day appeal period was announced.

B. ACTUAL TIME: 1:44 P.M.

APPLICATION OF CEARNAL COLLECTIVE, ARCHITECT, FOR DAVID BACK AND MONIKA DRAGGOO, TRUSTEES, 1062 COAST VILLAGE ROAD, APN 009-211-014, C-1/SD-3, LIMITED COMMERCIAL AND COASTAL OVERLAY ZONES, GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: GENERAL COMMERCE, LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM LAND USE DESIGNATION: COMMERCIAL (MST2016-00451)

The proposed project involves the demolition of an existing 14-unit apartment building and carport and the construction of a new 37,116 square foot (net), mixed-use development on a 25,554 square foot (0.59 acre) lot. The proposed project includes nine, two-story, three-bedroom residential condominium units (totaling 20,651 sq. ft.), one 874 square foot (net) commercial condominium unit, a subterranean garage with 23 parking spaces (totaling 15,591 sq. ft.). The residential units would range in size between 2,005 and 2,585 square feet and each would have a roof deck. The building heights would range between 21' and 38'-7". The project involves 7,600 cubic yards of cut and 50 cubic yards of fill. Eight trees would be removed (seven Canary Island Pines, one Gold Medallion) and five trees would be preserved (three Canary Island Pines, one Coast Live Oak, one Black Acacia). A total of 42 new trees would be planted, including two street trees. A 3.33 foot wide easement would be dedicated to the City in order to widen the sidewalk.

The discretionary applications required for this project are:

1. A Coastal Development Permit (CDP2017-00009) to allow the proposed development in the Non-Appealable Jurisdiction of the City's Coastal Zone (SBMC §28.44.060);
2. A Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map for a one-lot subdivision to create one (1) commercial condominium unit and nine (9) residential condominium units (SBMC Chapters 27.07, 27.13 and 27.20);
3. A Modification to allow encroachments into the required interior setback (SBMC §28.63.060 and SBMC §28.92.110); and
4. A Modification to allow less than the required distance between buildings (SBMC §28.21.070 and SBMC §28.92.110).

The project requires an environmental finding pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines Section 15183 (Projects Consistent with the General Plan).

Kathleen Kennedy, Associate Planner, gave the Staff presentation.

Brian Cearnal, gave the Applicant presentation, and was joined by Izzy Savage, The Cearnal Collective.

Public comment opened at 2:48 p.m.

Jose Arturo Gallegos spoke with concerns on rental cost of the units and explained that the units should be more affordable.

Public comment closed at 2:51 p.m.

Commissioner comments:

All Commissioners provided positive comments and expressed support for the project and its applications.

Commissioner Jordan:

- Stated that the loss of rental units is a concern and that the existing rental units should be considered affordable.
- Expressed concern about staff's responses to Santa Barbara County boards comments in the City's staff report, including assumptions that the site would eventually be subject to redevelopment and that there is a need for market-rate units, as reasons to support the project because they conflict with the affordable housing goals of the City.

Commissioner Thompson:

- Recognizes the loss of rental units due to the development of the project.
- The concerns that became apparent during the design review process have been adequately addressed and Modification requests are reasonable and supportable.

Commissioner Schwartz:

- Commends the applicant team for being receptive to and responsive to the neighbors concerns and feedback from the Montecito Planning Commission, Montecito Board of Architectural Review (MBAR) and City ABR.
- Expressed concerns that no modestly priced condominium projects are currently being proposed in the City.

Commissioner Higgins:

- Expressed support for the proposed Modifications.
- Stated that, In response to other Commissioners comments on affordability, this project is a reminder about why the City has the Average Unit Size Density Incentive Program (AUD) Ordinance and why we need to keep working on the AUD Ordinance.
- Stated that the proposed size of development is necessary in order to receive the capital return on investment, otherwise the existing units would have to remain. .

- Appreciated procedure involving the County but thought strange that they were concerned with standards, rather than focusing on design.

Commissioner Campanella:

- Stated that Modifications seemed reasonable.
- Stated that vacation rentals could be excluded by the CC&Rs.
- In regard to the AUD Ordinance, we need to see how we can get more rental units on the ground. Suggests keeping this proposed project in mind in the future when discussing AUD policy issues, including inclusionary fees.

Chair Wiscomb:

- Is sorry about the displaced renters but understands that the owner has the right to develop the property.
- Appreciates how the design team worked with neighbors and addressed their concerns.
- Appreciates staff's excellent overview and thoroughness in the staff report.

Commissioner Lodge:

- Expressed support for the project but also concerned about the loss of rental units that are clearly more affordable than the proposed project.

MOTION: Thompson/Jordan

Assigned Resolution No. 013-18

Approve the project, making the findings for the Environmental Review Exemption, Interior Setback Modification, Distance Between Buildings Modification, Vesting Tentative Subdivision Map, New Condominium Development, and Coastal Development Permit (CDP2017-00009) as outlined in the Staff Report dated May 3, 2018, subject to the Conditions of Approval in Exhibit A of the Staff Report.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 7 Noes: 0 Abstain: 0 Absent: 0

The ten calendar day appeal period was announced.

*** THE COMMISSION RECESSED FROM 3:50 TO 4:02 P.M. ***

IV. DISCUSSION ITEM

ACTUAL TIME: 4:02 P.M.

REVIEW AND COMMENT ON DRAFT CITY OF SANTA BARBARA ACCESS & PARKING DESIGN GUIDELINES

The proposed City of Santa Barbara Access and Parking Design Guidelines will update and replace the Santa Barbara Standards for Parking Design, last amended in 1982. Staff is requesting that Planning Commission provide comments on the draft document and recommend adoption by City Council.

Andrew Perez, Assistant Transportation Planner, gave the Staff presentation and Dan Gullett, Supervising Transportation Planner, was available to answer questions.

Public comment opened at 5:28 p.m.

Anna Marie Gott spoke with concerns regarding the reality of using stacked parking, their impracticality for the majority of drivers, and noise concerns with the mechanics of the machines; especially in residential areas. Bonnie Donovan and Jose Arturo Gallego ceded their time to Ms. Gott.

Public comment closed at 5:28 p.m.

Commissioner comments:

Commissioner Higgins:

- Provide more definitions and clarity on what is trying to be accomplished.
- Clearly define when the Design Guidelines are applicable.
- The idea of the exhibit showing before and after diagrams would benefit the Planning Commission and other decision making bodies to better clarify what is being changed.
- Would be in favor of having a lunch meeting prior to sending the draft Design Guidelines on to the City Council to discuss the documents applicability.

Commissioner Schwartz:

- A sustainability framework should be built into the Design Guidelines so as to relate to the principle and standards built into the City's General Plan.
- Include language in the Pedestrian Access and Circulation section to encourage lighting and security measures to promote a safe pedestrian environment.
- Cannot recommend that the draft Design Guidelines be forwarded to City Council for adoption however, it is a good first draft.
- Will not support the draft document because
 - This is not an external applicant where the commission needs to be sensitive to a time equals cost circumstance; but rather an internal City work product and City policy that the commission is responsible for getting right.
 - The Planning Commission is the land use decision making body with land use expertise and the City Council is a different type of decision making body that will not delve into the kind of detail that the Planning Commission will, so it is important for the Planning commission to reflect on the details before it is sent to the City Council for adoption.
 - Every project that the Planning Commission reviews has an issue of parking which is another reason why it is important to get this document right.

Commissioner Jordan:

- Agrees with Commissioner Higgins comments with regard to before and after diagrams.
- Expressed that this discussion would have served better as a lunch meeting or a briefing so that more discussion could have occurred.

Commissioner Lodge:

- Staff should implement comments received today and move on to the City Council for adoption.

- Sustainability standards should be re-reviewed and implemented.

Commissioner Thompson:

- Comments have been made on how to wordsmith a 36 year old document and make it more appropriate for its time and those comments can be implemented and forwarded to the City Council instead of precluding the document from going forward.

Commissioner Campanella:

- Is comfortable with passing on the document with Planning Commissioner comments along to City Council.

Chair Wiscomb:

- It would be important to reference an accessibility code in the Design Guidelines.
- Page 4, Section 5-B, titled Minimum Bay Dimensions, the language should be re-worded to refer to 76-89 degrees or 80-89 degrees is not permitted.
- Page 15, Section I, Driveway Materials, should be flavored with some sustainability language.
- Page 15, Section J, Ribbon Driveways, should also include some positive sustainability language and include examples of materials that would be acceptable.
- Page 16, Section 13, Bicycle Parking, under Long-Term and Short Term Bicycle Parking, consider adjusting their duration of time from 2 hours to 4 hours or removing a time duration completely.
- Looking at the staff report and what has been presented along with all the comments received today

MOTION: Jordan/Thompson

Assigned Resolution No. 014-18

Forward the Draft Access & Parking Design Guidelines to City Council with Planning Commission comments integrated into the document prior to Councils Review.

This motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 5 Noes: 2 (Higgins and Schwartz) Abstain: 0 Absent: 0

V. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

ACTUAL TIME: 5:59 P.M.

A. Committee and Liaison Reports:

1. Staff Hearing Officer Liaison Report

Commissioner Higgins reported on the Staff Hearing Officer meeting of April 11, 2018 and May 9, 2018.

2. Other Committee and Liaison Reports

- a. Commissioner Campanella reported on the Architectural Board of Review meeting of April 23, 2018.
- b. Commissioner Wiscomb reported on the Downtown Parking Committee meeting of May 10, 2018.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Wiscomb adjourned the meeting at 6:03 p.m.

Submitted by,

Krystal M. Vaughn, Commission Secretary

DRAFT