City of Santa Barbara
Planning Division

Memorandum

DATE: June 7, 2018

TO: Planning Commission

FROM: Megan Arciniega, Associate Planner
      Beatriz Gularte, Senior Planner

SUBJECT: 401-409 E Haley Mixed-Use AUD Project
            PC Conceptual Review – Change of Scope

PC Conceptual Review Required

The Planning Commission reviewed the mixed-use AUD project at 401-409 E. Haley on
July 6, 2017. Planning Commission Conceptual Review was required because the lot size
is more than 15,000 square feet and the project was utilizing the AUD Priority Housing
Overlay. The project consisted of demolishing all existing structures on two lots, merging
the lots, and constructing a new three-story mixed use building with 28 residential rental
units totaling 22,006 square feet and three commercial spaces totaling 2,684 square feet.
The residential unit mix included 5 studios, 9 one-bedroom units, and 14 two-bedroom
units, with an average unit size of 786 square feet.

The role of the Planning Commission in their Conceptual Review was to provide comment
and recommendation to ABR by majority vote on the “proposed design and improvement
of the project and the project’s consistency with the City’s General Plan” to aide them in
their review and approval as the decision-maker. The Planning Commission’s comments
and recommendation are captured in the July 6, 2017 Minutes, attached.

Change in Scope

Since July 6, 2017, the applicant has revised their project to include four short-term rental
units, by reducing the number of AUD rental units to 24 units. This change results in an
increase of nonresidential square footage proposed, which in turn requires approval of a
Development Plan in addition to the Design Review approval. The “net new” nonresidential square footage¹ does not exceed 3,000 square feet, so the Development
Plan is in the jurisdiction of the Architectural Board of Review (ABR).

¹ “Net new” nonresidential square footage is calculated by subtracting the existing nonresidential square footage on
the property that would be removed or replaced (“demo credit”) from the amount of proposed nonresidential square
footage proposed in the new project.
The purpose of this hearing is for Planning Commission to provide comment and recommendation by majority vote on the proposed project design changes and provide the applicant, staff, and the Architectural Board of Review (ABR) with comments on the proposed revisions to the design, and General Plan consistency (SBMC §30.150.060.E). The Planning Commission’s comments and recommendations are intended for use by the ABR in their deliberations.

It should also be noted that since the last Planning Commission review, the Title 30 Zoning Ordinance became effective in the noncoastal areas of the City. As such, this project is now subject to Title 30, not Title 28. Title 30 has reduced vehicle parking requirements and specific allowances for mechanical equipment, but more specific bicycle parking requirements (short term vs. long term) and codified open yard standards and location requirements previously implemented as staff policy. As proposed, the project complies with Title 30 requirements.

Design

Although some minor changes to the square footages were made, the proposed change to include short term rentals did not alter the exterior design of the project. The only design changes proposed are interior floor plan changes (removal of kitchens in three of the short term rentals)2 and new courtyard fencing and gates to restrict access of commercial/short-term rental lessees from utilizing the designated private open yard for the residential tenants, per Zoning Ordinance requirements.3

Zoning Consistency

Short term rentals (or hotel units) are an allowed use in the Manufacturing Commercial (M-C) zone. The standards for “hotels and similar uses” are specified in SBMC 30.185.220.

Since the project is not built yet, the reduction of residential AUD units in favor of including short term rental units does not constitute a hotel “conversion,” but rather a change in project description.

---

2 Short term rentals (or hotel units) without kitchens, are treated differently in the Zoning Ordinance than hotel units with kitchens. Without kitchens the hotel units are simply treated as commercial floor area. With kitchens however, they have the added layer of needing to comply with Base Density requirements per SBMC 30.185.220. SBMC 30.185.220 (Hotels and Similar Uses) clarifies: “For the purposes of this section, a maximum 12 inch by 12 inch bar sink, maximum five foot long counter top, microwave, and mini-fridge are not considered a “kitchen”. As such only one of the four short term rental units is proposed to have a full kitchen.

3 SBMC 30.140.140.E.6.a specifically prohibits designated open yard for residential units to include areas used or designed for use by any nonresidential purpose.
Density

The density requirements, however, are affected by the proposed project change. The project was initially proposing to utilize the Priority Housing Overlay density allowances of 63 du/ac with an average unit size of 811 square feet or less. However, the standards for “hotels and similar uses” specifies that guestrooms designed or constructed with kitchens shall be subject to the base residential density standards for the zone—which is 1 unit per 3,500 square feet (12 du/ac). As proposed, one4 of the four short term rental units would have a full kitchen.

Mixed-use projects that require two different density requirements must have sufficient lot area to meet the respective density requirements for each use independently. First, you must calculate the required lot area for the hotel unit with a full kitchen under base density (1 unit per 3,500 sf), and then the balance of the lot area may then utilize the AUD Priority Housing Overlay density of 63 du/ac.

The subject property comprises of 22,500 sf of lot area. SBMC Table 30.20.060.B identifies a base density for lots over 7,000 sf as “3 units or 1 unit per 3,500 sf, whichever is greater.” For one unit, 3,500 sf is required. Therefore, the balance of the remaining lot area after subtracting the lot area required for one unit at base density is 19,000 sf (22,500 sf – 3,500 sf).

The remaining 19,000 sf of lot area may be developed with a maximum of 27 units under the AUD priority housing overlay densities of 63 du/ac, with an average unit size of 811 sf. The revised project has 24 AUD units with an average unit size of 801 sf, and therefore complies with density requirements.

Parking

The parking requirements for the revised project are different than the original project for three reasons: 1) short term rental units require one space per guestroom (2 spaces for units with two rooms) whereas the AUD units required one space per unit regardless of rooms, 2) Title 30 changed parking requirements to 1 per 250 for almost all commercial uses, and 3) Title 30 specifies that fractions be rounded down when calculating the number of required spaces. As proposed, the parking requirement for the onsite development proposed is met. However, it should be noted that the site also accommodates parking for the Mill and Mill Annex through an offsite parking agreement. Previously, the number of spaces needed for the Mill and Mill annex was 11 spaces. However, with the adoption of Title 30 the number of required spaces likely has changed—the applicant believes only 10 spaces are required under Title 30. Staff is still in the process of confirming whether that is the correct number based on current floor

---

4 Please note that the number of short term rental (hotel) units with kitchens was reduced since the public notice for this hearing was published. As noticed, two of the four short term rental units were proposed to have kitchens, however this number has been reduced to one. The other three would be limited to a maximum 12 inch by 12 inch bar sink, maximum five foot long counter top, microwave, and mini-fridge.
plans and uses. The proposed parking would accommodate either the 10 or 11 offsite parking spaces.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vehicle Parking</th>
<th>Prior Project Under Title 28 Requirements</th>
<th>Revised Project Under Title 30 Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Coffee Shop</td>
<td>8 spaces (800 sf @ 1/100)</td>
<td>3 spaces (797 sf @ 1/250)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Retail/Office</td>
<td>6 spaces (1,389 sf @ 1/250)</td>
<td>6 spaces (1,537 sf @ 1/250)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Offsite (Mill)</td>
<td>11 spaces</td>
<td>10 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- STR</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5 spaces (1 per guestroom)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Residential</td>
<td>28 spaces (28 units @ 1/unit)</td>
<td>24 spaces (24 units @ 1/unit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL Required</td>
<td>53 spaces</td>
<td>48 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL Proposed</td>
<td>53 spaces</td>
<td>52 spaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Long Term Bicycle Parking                |                                           |                                           |
| - Commercial                             | 2 spaces (1/7 cars)                       | 1 space (1/1,750 x 75%)                   |
| - STR                                    | N/A                                       | 1 space (1/20 rooms min 2 x 50%)          |
| - Residential                            | 28 spaces (1/unit)                        | 24 spaces (1/unit)                        |
| TOTAL Required                           | 30 spaces                                 | 26 spaces                                 |
| TOTAL Proposed                           | 34 spaces                                 | 28 spaces                                 |

| Short Term Bicycle Parking               |                                           |                                           |
| - Commercial                             | No requirement                            | 0.3 space (1,750 x 25%)                  |
| - STR                                    | N/A                                       | 1 space (1/20 rooms min 2 x 50%)         |
| - Residential                            | No requirement                            | No requirement                            |
| TOTAL Required                           | 0 spaces                                  | 1.3 spaces                               |
| TOTAL Proposed                           | 0 spaces                                  | 4 spaces                                 |

Nonresidential Development

*Development Plan*

The project is proposing 5,462 sf of nonresidential area between the commercial and hotel units combined. Since there is 2,735 sf of existing/credited nonresidential square footage onsite, the project would result in 2,727 sf "net new" nonresidential floor area (5,462 sf - 2,735 sf demo credit = 2,727 sf). A Development Plan is required for any nonresidential construction project that involves the construction, addition, or conversion of more than 1,000 sf of "net new" nonresidential floor area. If the "net new" nonresidential floor area is between 1,000-3,000 sf, a Development Plan approval by the ABR is required. The subject properties have not utilized their available Minor Addition and Small Addition allocations for the two lots (2,000 minor + 4,000 small). Since the project only requires an additional 2,727 square feet, there is sufficient credit on site.
General Plan Consistency

The Planning Commission will need to consider if the proposed changes (assuming the project is revised to meet density standards) can still be found consistent with the General Plan policies. The applicable General Plan policies remain unchanged from the previous project (see Exhibit D of the July 6, 2017 Planning Commission Staff Report, in Attachment 2) with the exception of the following policies relating to hotels, and uses in the manufacturing zone.

- **Eco-Tourism.** Support eco-tourism, such as bicycle tours, that takes advantage of existing hotels and resources such as the beach, ocean, and foothill trails. (Economy and Fiscal Health Element Policy EF7).

- **Protect Industrial Zoned Areas.** Preserve the industrial zones as a resource for the service trades, product development companies, and other industrial businesses not precluding priority housing in the C-M, Commercial Manufacturing Zone. (Economy and Fiscal Health Element Policy EF15).

Next Steps

Following this Planning Commission concept review, the applicant would submit a complete project application and staff would commence environmental review. The project would then return to ABR for a decision regarding the Project Design and Development Plan approval. The project is not required to return to the Planning Commission.

Attachments:

1. July 6, 2017 Planning Commission Minutes
2. July 6, 2017 Planning Commission Staff Report
3. Project Plans
IV. CONCEPT REVIEW

ACTUAL TIME:  1:15 P.M.

APPLICATION OF DESIGNARC, AGENT FOR LAGUNA HALEY STUDIOS LLC, 401-409 EAST HALEY STREET, APNS 031-212-017 AND -018, C-M COMMERCIAL MANUFACTURING ZONE, GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: COMMERCIAL INDUSTRIAL/HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL/PRIORITY HOUSING OVERLAY 37-63 DU/ACRE (MST2016-00508)

The project is a proposal for a new mixed-use development using the Average Unit-Size Density (AUD) Incentive Program, in the C-M, Commercial Manufacturing zone. The project will include a voluntary lot merger of Assessor’s Parcels 031-212-017 and 031-212-018, which will result in one parcel of 22,500 square feet. Currently, there are two existing single-story commercial buildings and one residential duplex at 401 E. Haley Street, and one single-story, single-family residence (currently being used for commercial purposes), at 409 E. Haley. All existing residential and commercial structures totaling 5,828 square feet will be demolished. The proposal will include construction of a three-story, mixed-use building with 28 residential rental units totaling 22,006 square feet and three commercial spaces totaling 2,684 square feet of existing demolished square footage.

A ground-level parking garage with 53 parking spaces will be provided. Eleven of the spaces are off-site parking spaces for 406 E. Haley. Roof decks are proposed for the two-bedroom residential units. The residential unit mix will include 5 studios, 9 one-bedroom units, and 14 two-bedroom units, with an average unit size of 786 square feet; an average unit size of 896 square feet is allowed if developing at the proposed density. The proposed density on this parcel will be 55 dwelling units per acre on a parcel with a General Plan Land Use Designation of Commercial Industrial with Priority Housing Overlay that allows 37-63 dwelling units per acre.

This project requires Planning Commission Conceptual Review because the combined lot size is more than 15,000 square feet and the project is being proposed under the AUD Incentive Program Priority Housing Overlay. The purpose of this hearing is for Planning Commission and ATTACHMENT 1
the public to review the proposed project design and provide the applicant, staff, and the Architectural Board of Review (ABR) with comments on the proposed improvements, design, and General Plan consistency (SBMC §28.20.080).

The opinions of the Planning Commission may change, or there may be ordinance or policy changes that could affect the project that would result in requests for project design changes. **No formal action on the development proposal was taken at the concept review, nor was any determination made regarding environmental review of the proposed project.**

Contact: Megan Arciniega, Associate Planner
Email: MLowery@SantaBarbaraCA.gov Phone: (805) 564-5470, ext. 7587

Megan Arciniega, Associate Planner, gave the Staff presentation. Daniel Gullett, Supervising Transportation Planner, was available to answer questions.

Daryll & Kirsten Becker, Owners, introduced Mark Kirkhart, Architect, who gave the Applicant presentation.

Public comment opened at 1:57 p.m.

**The following people spoke in support:**
1. John Solontay
2. Liam Stimson
3. Maddy Jacobson
4. Michelle Bunker
5. Christopher Price

**The following people spoke in opposition or with concerns:**
1. Christine Neuhauser expressed concern for mass, views, and lack of neighborhood compatibility.
2. Ursula O'Neill shared photos and was concerned with views and the close proximity of the project and landscaping to her landscaping.
3. Marcia Burt was supportive but concerned with lighting, views, and parking.

Public comment closed at 2:05 p.m.

Kevin Moore, Architectural Board of Review (ABR) member, was present to answer any of the Commission’s questions. Mr. Moore stated that Planning Commission discussion on compatibility would be appropriate for ABR’s consideration.
Commission comments:

Is the project consistent with the goals/policies of the General Plan?

Commissioners Thompson, Jordan, Campanella, and Schwartz agreed that the project is consistent with the policies of the General Plan, namely providing housing consistent with the Housing Element.

Commissioners Lodge, Wiscomb, and Higgins stated that the project did and did not meet the policies of the General Plan. Commissioner Lodge was concerned with the commercial aspects of the project that would create more jobs and result in the need for more employee housing. If the commercial was removed, it would eliminate 15 parking spaces and be more appropriate than having more commercial on Haley.

Commissioner Wiscomb was significantly concerned with the pedestrian and cycling experience near this project. Though the views are not considered significant public vista points in the City, look at Land Use Element policy LG.12 for enhancement of community character; people expect mountain views in Santa Barbara, especially in that area, and this building will block those views. We are trying to create walkable alternative means of transportation in Santa Barbara, which is promoted by the AUD program, yet this building interferes with the beauty of walking in Santa Barbara.

Commissioner Schwartz noted that the project optimizes multi-modal transportation in the City consistent with the Circulation Element and that the City has not yet adopted implementation strategies for Visual Resource Protection ER 29.1 and ER 29.2; as such, views are analyzed on a project by project basis. Noted that when standing in front of even single-story buildings in this area, views to the mountains are blocked.

Commissioner Higgins wondered if, when the new Zoning Ordinance is adopted and the parking standards are reduced, would the parking demand drop on this property and then the parking stackers would not be required. This could allow the project height to be dropped 6 to 8 feet and would allow for more mountain views.

Is the project size/mass/bulk/height/scale appropriate for the location and the neighborhood?

A majority of the Commission supported the size/mass/bulk/height/scale as appropriate for the location and the neighborhood given that the height could have been 45’, the scale is human scale, and other nearby buildings are the same height or taller. Chair Higgins shared a dissenting opinion, stating he preferred that the offsite parking did not have to be parked there and could be brought down.

Commissioner Jordan noted that the contrast between what is there now and what is proposed to be there appears to be driving the discomfort on the size/mass/bulk, but buildings in the neighborhood that are successful are similar in size and height, and even built to the property lines. Appreciated the cutouts and the architectural design.

Some Commissioners were conditional in their support, stating that the project was too massive on the Haley Street side. Commissioner Schwartz added that there might be artistic ways to soften what may appear to be larger and bulkier than the actual square footage without necessitating a change in the height or the size.
Does the design preserve or enhance important public views or public vistas?

Commissioners Thompson, Lodge, and Wiscomb agreed that important public views were blocked from Haley and Laguna and also expressed that the term “important” was very subjective.

Commissioner Schwartz and Higgins noted that the City does not have codified scenic vistas, view corridors, or adopted standards to protect views to apply to this question. Commissioner Higgins added that it is unfortunate that we lose the public on this process when we do not have the tools to define “important.”

Commissioners Campanella, Schwartz, and Jordan stated that the views along Haley and Laguna are not considered significant public vista points like a park or public gathering area. They noted that this a commercial working corridor and is not the same as other areas in our community that have been called out for special consideration in policy making and project approval in regard to views. Views from streets in this area heading towards the mountains all have some blockage, but the mountains remain visible from across the street or further up the block.

Does the project comply with the Haley-Milpas Design Guidelines?

Commissioner Thompson stated that the Haley-Milpas Guidelines are out of date, but the project seems to comply with them.

Commissioner Lodge showed visual examples of the industrial look of steel that did not fall under the Haley-Milpas Guidelines or the General Guidelines, and some contemporary single-colored projects that gave a Mediterranean feel.

Commissioners Jordan, Wiscomb, and Campanella deferred to the judgment of the Architectural Board of Review (ABR).

Commissioner Schwartz referenced the four Urban Design Districts (Hispanic/Pueblo, Boulevard, Industrial, Mixed) in the Guidelines, noting that all exist within a few blocks of Haley/Laguna and there is not just one dominant architectural style. She found that even though the Guidelines are outdated and contradictory, she could find the project compatible because of the significant diversity of architectural styles in the neighborhood.

Commissioner Higgins acknowledged that the Guidelines are outdated but does not think the design lines up with the “Pueblo Revival” style outlined in the Haley-Milpas Design Guidelines. Additionally, the ability of AUD buildings to resonate with the architectural style of the Santa Barbara area is important to the success of the AUD program.

General Commission comments:

Commissioner Thompson stated that that while the project does block views and is too massive along the Haley side, overall the loss of views is a reasonable trade-off for needed housing.

Commissioner Jordan stated the project benefits include that it may eventually become overparked in the evening, maybe even in the daytime. The project includes more outdoor living
space than was required. There were no modifications requested. It comes in under the allowable zoning for height, density, and setbacks. There are many multi-story examples in that neighborhood that are built or being built that are just as tall or taller.

Commissioner Wiscomb remained concerned about the interior setbacks and working with the neighbors to come to a mutual conclusion that works for everyone. A good neighbor policy would be important. She appreciated the ABR’s work in developing the articulation of the building as it will help with the pedestrian experience. She would like to see a denser canopy on Haley Street and a lush environment with greenery and shade to make it a pedestrian-friendly place.
I. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project is a proposal for a new mixed-use development using the Average Unit-Size Density (AUD) Incentive Program, in the C-M, Commercial Manufacturing zone. The project will include a voluntary lot merger of Assessor’s Parcels 031-212-017 and 031-212-018, which will result in one parcel of 22,500 square feet. Currently, there are two existing single-story commercial buildings and one residential duplex at 401 E. Haley Street, and one single-story, single-family residence (currently being used for commercial purposes), at 409 E. Haley. All existing residential and commercial structures totaling 5,828 square feet will be demolished. The proposal will include construction of a three-story, mixed-use building with 28 residential rental units totaling 22,006 square feet and three commercial spaces totaling 2,684 square feet of existing demolished square footage.

A ground-level parking garage with 53 parking spaces will be provided. Eleven of the spaces are off-site parking spaces for 406 E. Haley. Roof decks are proposed for the two-bedroom residential units. The residential unit mix will include 5 studios, 9 one-bedroom units, and 14 two-bedroom units, with an average unit size of 786 square feet; an average unit size of 896 square feet is allowed if developing at the proposed density. The proposed density on this parcel will be 55 dwelling units per acre on a parcel with a General Plan Land Use Designation of Commercial Industrial with Priority Housing Overlay that allows 37-63 dwelling units per acre.

II. CONCEPT REVIEW

This project requires Planning Commission Conceptual Review because the lot size is more than 15,000 square feet and the project is being proposed under the AUD Priority Housing Overlay. The purpose of this hearing is for the Planning Commission and the public to review the proposed project design and provide the applicant, staff, and the Architectural Board of Review (ABR) with comments on the proposed design and improvements, and General Plan consistency (SBMC §28.20.080).

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission review the proposed project, consider the issues outlined in this report, and provide comment and recommendation by majority vote regarding the proposed design and improvement of the project and the project’s consistency with the City’s
General Plan. The Planning Commission’s comments and recommendations will be communicated to the ABR for use in their deliberations on the project.

III. SITE INFORMATION AND PROJECT STATISTICS

A. SITE INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>DesignArc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property Owner</td>
<td>Laguna Haley Studios, LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Information</td>
<td>Parcel Numbers: 031-212-018, -017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
General Plan: Commercial Industrial/Medium High Density Residential, Priority Housing Overlay (37-63 du/acre)  
Zoning: C-M (Commercial Manufacturing)

Existing Use: Commercial & Multi-family Residential  
Topography: 2%

Adjacent Land Uses
- North - Commercial & Residential
- South - Commercial
- East - Commercial
- West - Commercial

### IV. ZONING CONSISTENCY ANALYSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Requirement/ Allowance</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUD</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Units</td>
<td>37-63 du/ac</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>55 du/ac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Unit Density</td>
<td>896 sf (55 du/ac)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>786 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Average Unit</td>
<td>811 (63 du/ac)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setbacks</td>
<td>5 feet (variable)</td>
<td>24 feet</td>
<td>5 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Front (Haley)</td>
<td>5 feet (variable)</td>
<td>6 feet</td>
<td>5 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Front (Laguna)</td>
<td>0 feet (variable)</td>
<td>0 feet</td>
<td>0 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Interior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Height</td>
<td>45 feet / 4 stories</td>
<td>14 feet / 1 stories</td>
<td>44 feet / 3 stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>8 spaces</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>8 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Coffee Shop</td>
<td>6 spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td>6 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Retail/Office</td>
<td>11 spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td>11 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Offsite (Mill)</td>
<td>28 spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td>28 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Parking</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Outdoor Living Space</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Floo...</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>All 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; Floo...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Space</td>
<td>225 sf</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>225 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Coverage</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6,343 sf</td>
<td>19,359 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Building</td>
<td></td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Paving/Driveway</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>14,157 sf</td>
<td>1,596 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Landscaping</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2,000 sf</td>
<td>1,545 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The project is proposed under the City’s AUD Program, which allows up to 63 dwelling units per acre with an average unit size of 811 square feet under the Priority Housing Density
requirements. At 0.52 acres, the subject property can have 32 units with an average unit size of 811 square feet—resulting in a potential building size of 25,952 square feet. The project proposes 24,388 square feet of residential development, with 2,506 square feet of commercial space, and a 15,603 square foot parking garage. The residential development would include 28 units, with an average unit size of 786 square feet. The Priority Housing Overlay density allowance is contingent upon the project being developed as rental housing. As such, the project will be required to record a covenant against title requiring the housing to remain rental housing for as long as the housing is developed at the Priority Housing Overlay density.

Although the surrounding area is mostly comprised of one and two-story buildings, the Housing Authority “Artisan Court” development at 422 E. Cota sits to the north of the proposed project site, and has one, two and three-story elements. Additionally, the AUD ordinance allows buildings up to four stories and 45 feet. The proposed project would have three stories and would not exceed 44 feet 2 inches, and would therefore comply with zoning height requirements.

The project has two frontages facing public streets. The AUD Program requires a 5-foot variable setback from each of the front property lines. The project would provide a 5-foot setback from Haley Street, and a 5-foot setback from Laguna Street. The AUD Program does not require a setback from interior property lines adjacent to nonresidential zones. As such, the project is proposing no setbacks along the interior property lines.

The project uses the Private Outdoor Living Space (Method A), providing private patios and roof decks for each of the units in addition to a Common Open Space area on the second floor podium level. Each of the decks and patios exceed the Private Outdoor Living Space area requirements. Even the smallest patios are 24 square feet larger than required, and the largest patios (roof decks) exceed the requirement by as much as 349 square feet.

The AUD Program requires one parking space per residential unit. There is no requirement for covered parking under the AUD Incentive Program. The proposed project provides 28 parking spaces (all covered) and a bicycle parking room within the building for the residential units. Additionally, 25 commercial parking spaces are provided (11 of which are for offsite parking for The Mill at 406 E. Haley Street).

V. BACKGROUND

A. DESIGN REVIEW

This project was reviewed by the ABR on three separate occasions (see Minutes, Exhibit D). Prior to the ABR’s third concept review, the applicant revised the plans to address the key concerns identified in the initial ABR review and the PRT review. Most notably, the setbacks along Haley Street and Laguna Street were increased, which allowed for planting along the building frontage in addition to the widened sidewalk with street trees, creating an improved pedestrian experience along Haley Street. The ABR also appreciated the breaking up of the massing of the building and the adjustments to the railing and wall, which also aided in reducing the apparent mass. Although the comments were generally favorable, the ABR stated they would hold their comments on the neighborhood compatibility criteria until being able to view story poles for the project, but noted that the project complies with the Haley-Milpas Design
Guidelines and relates to the architectural character of its industrial surroundings. Ultimately, the ABR continued the project to the Planning Commission with comments.

B. PRT REVIEW

The project was reviewed by the City’s Pre-Application Review Team (PRT) in January 2017. On January 26, 2017, the PRT comments were provided to the Applicant.

The project plans were modified to address the primary concerns of the PRT review prior to returning to ABR for the third concept review—namely, compliance with the required front setbacks.

The PRT letter also identified additional items that will need to be addressed prior to Project Design Approval by the ABR, such as assessment of potential hazardous materials onsite relating to the prior commercial facilities, demonstration of feasible implementation of Storm Water Management Program requirements, clarification of nonresidential square footage to be demolished for Growth Management Program documentation, and a voluntary lot merger to combine the two parcels.

VI. ISSUE AREAS

Per SBMC §28.20.080 (Planning Commission Review of Rental Housing Projects), the Planning Commission shall provide comment and recommendation by majority vote regarding the proposed design and improvement of the project and the project’s consistency with the City’s General Plan.

A. PROJECT DESIGN

1. NEIGHBORHOOD COMPATIBILITY

The ABR Ordinance (SBMC §22.68.045.B) outlines certain criteria that the ABR is to consider before granting design approval of a project. These criteria/considerations are:

a. Does the project fully comply with all applicable City Charter and Municipal Code requirements? Is the project’s design consistent with design guidelines applicable to the location of the project within the City?

b. Is the design of the project compatible with the desirable architectural qualities and characteristics which are distinctive of Santa Barbara and of the particular neighborhood surrounding the project?

c. Is the size, mass, bulk, height, and scale of the project appropriate for its location and its neighborhood?

d. Is the design of the project appropriately sensitive to adjacent Federal, State, and City Landmarks and other nearby designated historic resources, including City structures of merit, sites, or natural features?

e. Does the design of the project respond appropriately to established scenic public vistas?

f. Does the project include an appropriate amount of open space and landscaping?
To date, the ABR has made favorable comments regarding the appropriateness of the proposed design of the project including the massing, the stepping down of the podium, the opening up of the massing along the east elevation, the reduction in height along the Haley Street elevation, and the implementation of niche treatments such as the planters in the pedestrian parkway, incorporating recessed windows and patios, use of steel trowel plaster and the inclusion of accent landscaping. The ABR also stated that the project was consistent with the Haley-Milpas Design Guidelines, namely because it is a contemporary interpretation of the pueblo style architecture; the design character is slightly different from the Downtown Santa Barbara Spanish style and has the potential to be less expensive; and the project relates to the architectural character of its industrial surroundings.

Feedback from the Planning Commission specifically in regard to size, mass, bulk, height, and scale of the project and whether it is appropriate for its location and its neighborhood would assist the ABR in their review of the project.

**B. GENERAL PLAN CONSISTENCY**

A brief summary of the most relevant General Plan goals, policies, and implementation strategies is provided below. A more complete list is provided in Exhibit E.

**1. LAND USE ELEMENT**

The Land Use Element includes a policy (Policy LG6, Location of Residential Growth) to encourage new residential units with high densities to be located in the Downtown area and includes an implementation action (LG6.3, Priority Housing Overlay) to provide for increased densities in select areas of the city, which was implemented through adoption of the Priority Housing Overlay. The project is proposed at 55 dwelling units per acre and would add 28 rental units to the City’s housing stock by using the City’s AUD Program and Priority Housing Overlay. Also, the C-M Zone although Medium High Density (15-27 dwelling units per acre) was identified as an area where the Priority Housing Overlay would be appropriate.

The Land Use Element also calls for enhancement of community character (Policy LG12, Community Character) and includes an implementation action (LG12.3, Building Set-Backs) to allow for variation in building setbacks. The project provides more than the required minimum five-foot variable setback along the street frontages.

The project is proposed along a commercial corridor and centrally located by many commercial uses and public transit that could serve the residents.

**2. HOUSING ELEMENT**

The Housing Element includes multiple policies and implementation strategies encouraging and facilitating the development of affordable, rental, senior and special needs housing. The proposed project would provide 28 new rental units, consisting of 5 studios (ranging from 399-430 square feet), 9 one-bedrooms (ranging from 705-713 square feet), and 14 two-bedroom units (ranging from 956-1,105 square feet).
3. **Circulation Element**

The Circulation Element includes multiple policies and implementation strategies to encourage alternative modes of transportation. The project is located along a Class 2 cross-town bicycle path along Haley Street and the project would provide secure bicycle parking for the residents (C7.7, Bicycle Parking and Other Needs). The project would also be adjacent to MTD Bus Line 20 that runs along Haley Street—specifically MTD bus stop 428. Per the ABR, the pedestrian experience along Haley and Laguna Streets would be improved by the proposed project (Goal 5, Increase Walking and Other Paths of Travel). Lastly, the proposed commercial uses on the site would contribute to the commercial services along the Haley corridor, providing even more walkable services for the residents in the area.

4. **Environmental Resources Element & Conservation Element**

The Environmental Resources Element and the Conservation Element both include policies (ER29, Visual Resources Protection) and implementation strategies to protect visual resources. The implementation strategies (ER29.1, Document Public Views and ER29.2, Evaluation Criteria) have not been adopted at this time, and will be considered with the Environmental Resources Element work program. Currently visual resource considerations are done on a case by case basis depending on the specifics of the project location and design.

The proposed project is located in the Downtown area where views of the mountains are available to the public at varying degrees. Due to topography and the wide street corridor of Haley Street, there are fairly expansive views of the mountains when traveling towards Milpas Street, and northeast on Laguna. The EIR prepared for the build out of the General Plan recognized that while the location and number of new buildings was unknown, it assumed that such growth could include construction of a number of new three to four story buildings throughout the City. The General Plan EIR also included analysis of visual impacts along Haley and Gutierrez Street (Impact VIS 3.3, Haley and Gutierrez Streets Impacts) and found that with existing policies and those proposed under Plan Santa Barbara, that impacts to community character within the Haley and Gutierrez corridors would be less than significant. The General Plan recognized that new nonresidential or mixed use projects of up to three stories could change the character of portions of these corridors and that new development that replaces smaller scale structures with new multiple story buildings could incrementally decrease the number of locations with distant views accessible to pedestrians and motorists, and limit the sweep and panorama from some viewpoints.

The proposed project would introduce a new three-story structure into the area that would partially block views of the mountains while traveling down Laguna Street and Haley Street. The proposed development will diminish viewing opportunities to the public from the streets and intersection, however, views along Laguna and Haley are not considered a significant public vista point such as that of a park or public gathering area. The project attempts to reduce its intrusion of the mountain views along these corridors to some extent, by breaking up the massing, with the bulk of the building to under 38 feet, with alternating parapets and roof deck trellises reaching 44 feet. Furthermore, as you travel
down Haley you would continue to have mountain views afforded by the wide street. Laguna Street however, is narrower in comparison, and mountain views are blocked by even single story structures. The ABR found the project to be consistent with the Milpas-Haley Design Guidelines because the design and architecture relates to the character of the industrial surroundings.

Staff requests Planning Commission feedback regarding consistency with the City’s General Plan, including policies related to Land Use, Housing, Circulation Elements, and Environmental Resources and Conservation Elements.

II. NEXT STEPS

Following the Planning Commission concept review, the applicant would submit a complete project application and staff would commence environmental review. The project would then return to ABR for a decision regarding Project Design and Final approval. The project is not required to return to the Planning Commission.

Exhibits:

A. Site Plan, Site Photos, Floor Plans, Building Elevations
B. Applicant's Letter
C. ABR Minutes
D. Applicable General Plan Policies
Exhibit A: The project plans for 401-409 E. Haley Street have been distributed separately.

A copy of the plans is available for viewing at the Planning and Zoning Counter, 630 Garden Street, Santa Barbara, CA between the hours of 8:30 A.M and 4:30 P.M. Monday through Thursday, and every other Friday. Please check our website under City Calendar to verify closure dates.
June 16, 2017

Planning Department
City of Santa Barbara
630 Garden St.
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

Address: 401 & 409 E Haley Street
Case #: MST2016-00508
Zone: C-M Zone / Medium High Residential AUD
APN: 031-212-017 / 031-212-018
RE: Pre-Application Review Team (PRT) Submittal – Revised 06.15.2017

Dear Ms. Megan Lowery:

On behalf of the Ownership entity, Laguna Haley Studios II, LLC, DesignARC is submitting the following packet for a Pre-Application Review Team, as required for the proposed mixed-use development at 401/409 E Haley Street consisting of (28) residential apartments under the Average Unit Density (AUD) program, and 2,506 square feet of commercial/retail uses.

The project comprises of the voluntary lot merger between 401 & 409 E Haley Street properties for a total of 22,500 square foot parcel, the demolition of the existing buildings totaling 5,828 square feet, and the construction of a new three-story mixed-use building with (5) studios, (9) one-bedroom units, and (14) two-bedroom units, with an average unit size of 786 square feet. The proposed density on the parcel will be 55 dwelling units per acre, where the land use allows for 37-63 dwelling units per acre.

Project also includes a parking garage with a total of 53 spaces, which consists of 28 residential parking, 15 spaces for commercial/retail uses, and 11 off-site parking for The Mill property (402 E Haley Street). The proposed parking will accommodate 1 space for each residential unit, as per the AUD ordinance, for a total of 28 spaces. The remaining balance of 25 spaces would be for commercial office and retail uses during the day and would be available for residents’ guests in the evenings and weekends after business hours.

The project has received three conceptual review at the Architectural Board of Review (ABR) and a PRT review from City staff. Revisions to the drawings to date have been made accordingly, to address some of the concerns raised by the board and staff comments, which resulted in the loss of 1 unit, the loss to 800 square feet of commercial space, the loss of 5 parking spaces, further on-grade setback along Haley and Laguna streets, and a reduction in building mass along Haley Street with a step in the podium. Due to the size of the combined lots, exceeding 15,000 square feet, the project requires a PRT application followed by a Planning Commission hearing for Comments Only before the project can receive a Project Design Approval at ABR.

EXHIBIT B
We look forward to receiving the Planning Commission comments and securing project entitlements at ABR for Project Design Approval. Should you have any questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me at 805-687-1525 x132 or via email at mcinarli@designarc.net.

Respectfully,

DesignARC, Inc.

Melisa Cinarli Turner
Sr. Project Manager
Letters of support from Dario Pini, John Winsor, the proprietor of Riviera Market, and Santos Leow, were acknowledged.

Public comment closed at 5:38 p.m.

**Motion:** Project Design Approval and indefinite continuance to In-Progress review, with comments:

1. Study enhancing the small third floor stair element to appear more as a cupola.
2. Study the southwest corner and south elevations to provide a better alignment between the 2nd story projection and garage openings below and allow corner hip roof to complete itself.
3. Study creating flat, usable open spaces with more privacy using taller plantings.
4. The Board found that the project qualifies for an exemption from further environmental review under CEQA Guidelines Section 15183, based on the City Staff analysis and CEQA Certificate of Determination on file for this project.
5. The Lower Riviera Special Design District (Bungalow District) findings were made:
   a) Expressed conditions of approval have been imposed on the proposed development which appropriately incorporate the existing structures or architectural features or other aspects of the these structures (or of the site involved) into the new development, or these structures, features or aspects will be appropriately replicated in the new development; and
   b) The proposed development will not substantially diminish the unique architectural style and character of the Bungalow District as a residential neighborhood of the City.

**Action:** Gradin/Wittausch, 7/0/0. Motion carried.

The ten-day appeal period was announced.

* THE BOARD RECESSAD AT 5:57 P.M. AND RECONVENED AT 6:25 P.M. *

**CONCEPT REVIEW - NEW ITEM: PUBLIC HEARING**

5. **401 & 409 E HALEY STREET**  
   C-M Zone  
   (6:20)  
   **Assessor's Parcel Number:** 031-212-018  
   **Application Number:** MST2016-00508  
   **Owner:** Laguna Haley Studios II, LLC  
   **Architect:** DesignARC, Inc.

(Proposal for a new mixed-use development using the Average Unit Density Incentive Program (AUD). The project will include a voluntary lot merger of Assessor parcels 031-212-017 and 031-212-018 which will result in one parcel of 22,500 square feet. All existing residential and commercial structures totaling 5,828 square feet will be demolished. The proposal will include construction of a three-story, mixed-use building with 29 residential units totaling 22,497 square feet and three commercial spaces totaling 3,306 square feet. A ground level parking garage will provide 58 parking spaces. Roof decks are also proposed. The residential unit mix will include six studios, nine, 1-bedroom units and 14, 2-bedroom units, with an average unit size of 775 square feet. The proposed density on this parcel will be 56 dwelling units per acre on a parcel with a General Plan Land Use Designation of Commercial, Industrial, Priority Housing, 37-63 dwelling units per acre. No grading is proposed. This project requires Planning Commission approval.)

(Comments only; requires Environmental Assessment and Planning Commission review.)

**EXHIBIT C**
Actual time: 6:25 p.m.

Present: Mark Kirkhart, Jason Green, Architects

Public comment opened at 6:38 p.m.

1) Dominic Rios, expressed concerns regarding possible noise complaints by residents against his garage.

Public comment closed at 6:40 p.m.

**Motion:** Continued six weeks to Full Board with comments:

1. The Board found that, in general, the mass, bulk, and scale are acceptable.
2. There was concern, by at least half the Board members, about the pedestrian impacts of the third story elements along Haley Street.

**Action:** Gradin/Miller, 6/0/0. Motion carried. (Cung absent).

---

**CONCEPT REVIEW - NEW ITEM: PUBLIC HEARING**

6. **2900 BLK CLIFF DR 2945 SEG ID**

   (7:20) Assessors Parcel Number: ROW-002-945
   Application Number: MST2016-00505
   Contractor: Cable Engineering Services
   Owner: City of Santa Barbara - Public Works

   (Proposal for AT&T Mobility to remove an existing 40'-0" tall wood power pole without wireless equipment and install a new wood pole of the same height with a new Cantenna mounted on top. This installation site is a temporary interim location due to the roundabout project construction. No other work is proposed.)

   *(Requires No Visual Impact findings and Coastal Review.)*

   Actual time: 7:24 p.m.

   Present: Peter Hilger, Applicant

   Public comment opened at 7:31 p.m. As no one wished to speak, public comment was closed.

   **Motion:** Project Design and Final Approval with the condition that the pole be located a minimum of three feet from the edge of the bike path. No Visual Impact findings were made.

   **Action:** Wittausch/Tripp, 6/0/0. Motion carried. (Cung absent).

The ten-day appeal period was announced.

**MEETING ADJOURNED AT 7:35 P.M.**
CONCEPT REVIEW - CONTINUED ITEM

4. 401 & 409 E HALEY STREET

(4:55) Assessor’s Parcel Number: 031-212-018
Application Number: MST2016-00508
Owner: Laguna Haley Studios II, LLC
Architect: Designarc INC

C-M Zone

(Proposal for a new mixed-use development using the Average Unit Density Incentive Program (AUD), in the C-M, Commercial zone. The project will include a voluntary lot merger of Assessor parcels 031-212-017 and 031-212-018 which will result in one parcel of 22,500 square feet. All existing residential and commercial structures totaling 5,828 square feet will be demolished. The proposal will include construction of a three-story, mixed-use building with 29 residential units totaling 22,497 square feet and three commercial spaces totaling 3,306 square feet. A ground level parking garage will provide 58 parking spaces. Roof decks are also proposed. The residential unit mix will include six studios, nine, 1-bedroom units and 14, 2-bedroom units, with an average unit size of 775 square feet. The proposed density on this parcel will be 56 dwelling units per acre on a parcel with a General Plan Land Use Designation of Commercial, Industrial, Priority Housing, and 37-63 dwelling units per acre. No grading is proposed. This project requires Planning Commission comments.)

(Second Concept Review, Comments only; requires Environmental Assessment and Planning Commission review.)

Actual time: 5:40 p.m.

Present: Mark Kirkhart, Architect, Designarc; Jaeson Greer, Architect, Designarc; and Mellissa Turner, Project Manager, Designarc.

Public comment opened at 5:56 p.m.

The following people spoke in opposition or with concerns:
1. Dominic Rios presented concerns regarding the north east corner
2. Natalia Govoni presented concerns regarding the size, style, bulk and scale of this project, and project approved by the Board in the past, and feels they negatively impact the city’s integrity.

Public comment closed at 5:59 p.m.

Straw vote: How many Board Members agree that the applicant should study reducing the podium height whenever it is not needed for stacked parking”? 3/1 Passed

Straw vote: How many Board Members agree that the applicant should study varying the parapet heights on the upper floors and step back the roof decks from the street-facing fronts of the building along East Haley? 2/2 Fail

Straw vote: How many Board Members agree that the applicant should eliminate the trellises that are visible as four story elements from the street level? 2/2 Fail
Motion: Continued indefinitely to the Planning Commission for return to Full Board with comments:
1. Study reducing the podium height whenever it is not needed for stacked parking.
2. Study reducing the massing and visual impact along the east corridor as well as opportunities for pulling back from the property line.
3. Some Board members agree that the applicant should study varying the parapet heights on the upper floors and stepping back the roof decks from the street-facing fronts of the building along East Haley.
4. One suggestion was made to add planting along the parapet edge.
5. Some Board members agree that the applicant should eliminate the trellises that are visible as four story elements from the street level.
6. The Board appreciates that the changes that have been made thus far especially:
   a. The improvements to the pedestrian experience on Haley Street.
   b. The massing being broken up to avoid one long façade.
   c. Adjustments to the railing and wall to reduce the apparent mass.
7. The Board agrees that the project is in keeping with the Haley/Milpas design manual for the following reasons:
   a. The design is a contemporary interpretation of pueblo style architecture.
   b. The design character is slightly different from the Downtown Santa Barbara Spanish Style and has the potential to be less expensive.
   c. The project relates to the architectural character of its industrial surroundings.
   d. The project implements the use of wall niche treatments by integrating planters in the pedestrian walkway, incorporating recessed windows and patios, the use of steel trowel plaster, and the inclusion of accent landscaping.
8. The current Haley/Milpas design manual is an outdated manual, however the project is in keeping with the guideline.

Action: Witasch/Gardin, 4/0/0. (Watkins stepped down. Miller absent.) Motion carried.

* Note: see ratification of minutes on 1/30/2017 for additional comments *

CONCEPT REVIEW - NEW ITEM: PUBLIC HEARING

5. 1062 COAST VILLAGE RD

(5:40) Assessor’s Parcel Number: 009-211-014
Application Number: MST2016-00451
Owner: David Back Revocable Trust
Architect: The Cearnal Collective, LLP

(Proposal for a new 30,316 square foot, 3-story mixed use development on a 25,215 square foot lot in the non-appealable jurisdiction of the Coastal Zone. The parcel is currently developed with a 10,872 square foot apartment building and carport, and the proposal involves the demolition of all buildings and paving, and the removal of all site trees. The project comprises nine condominium units totaling 20,192 square feet, and a 5,913 private residential garage area providing 18 spaces. The project also includes 966 square feet of commercial space, and 8,724 square feet of commercial and common garage areas providing six parking spaces and one commercial bicycle space. There will be 8,500 cubic yards of grading excavation. This project requires Planning Commission review for a Tentative Subdivision Map.)

(Comments only. Requires Environmental Assessment and Planning Commission review.)

Actual time: 6:40 p.m.
CONCEPT REVIEW - CONTINUED ITEM

4. 401 & 409 E HALEY STREET  
(4:35) Assessor’s Parcel Number: 031-212-018  
Application Number: MST2016-00508  
Owner: Laguna Haley Studios II, LLC  
Architect: DesignARC, INC.

(C-M Zone)

(Proposal for a new mixed-use development using the Average Unit-Size Density Incentive Program (AUD), in the C-M, Commercial zone. The project will include a voluntary lot merger of Assessor parcels 031-212-017 and 031-212-018 which will result in one parcel of 22,500 square feet. All existing residential and commercial structures totaling 5,828 square feet will be demolished. The proposal will include construction of a three-story, mixed-use building with 28 residential units totaling 22,006 square feet and three commercial spaces totaling 2,506 square feet. A ground level parking garage will provide 53 parking spaces. Roof decks are also proposed. The residential unit mix will include five studios, nine 1-bedroom units and 14 2-bedroom units, with an average unit size of 786 square feet. The proposed density on this parcel will be 55 dwelling units per acre on a parcel with a General Plan Land Use Designation of Commercial, Industrial, Priority Housing, 37-63 dwelling units per acre. No grading is proposed. This project requires Planning Commission comments.)

(Third Concept Review. Comments Only. Project requires Planning Commission review. Item was last reviewed on January 17, 2017.)

Actual time: 4:30 p.m.

Present: Mark Kirkhart, Architect, DesignARC; Jaeson Greer, Architect, DesignARC; Melissa Turner, Project Manager, DesignARC; and Megan Arciniega, Associate Planner, City of Santa Barbara

Public comment opened at 4:46 p.m., and as no one wished to speak, it closed.

Straw vote: How many Board members could support implementing a playfulness, curved linear walls, to the building? 2/2 Failed

Straw vote: How many Board members could support reducing the visible trellis areas on the west side view? 3/1 Passed

Straw vote: How many Board members could support the planters that have been added at the setback? 2/2 Failed

Motion: Continued indefinitely to Planning Commission with comments:

1. Study reducing the visual impacts of the building by reducing or eliminating the three trellises on the third floor deck level, on the west elevation, so they are not visible at the pedestrian level.
2. Study the vertical planting areas, which have been added to the setbacks adjacent to the building.
3. The Board appreciated the changes that have been made thus far, especially:
   a. The improvements to the pedestrian experience on Haley Street.
   b. The massing being broken up to avoid one long façade.
   c. Adjustments to the railing and wall to reduce the apparent mass.
   d. The reduction in height along the Haley Street elevation.
e. The stepping down of the podium.
f. The opening up of the massing along the East elevation.
g. The opening up of the formerly solid parapet walls to railings to help reduce the visual impact.
h. The increased setbacks along Haley and Laguna Street.

4. The Board agreed that the project was in keeping with the Haley/Milpas design manual for the following reasons:
   a. The design is a contemporary interpretation of pueblo style architecture.
   b. The design character is slightly different from the Downtown Santa Barbara Spanish style and has the potential to be less expensive.
   c. The project relates to the architectural character of its industrial surroundings.
   d. The project implements the use of wall niche treatments by integrating planters in the pedestrian pathway, incorporating recessed windows and patios, use of steel trowel plaster, and inclusion of accent landscaping.

Action: Gradin/Moore, 4/0/0. (Watkins and Tripp absent.) Motion carried.

CONCEPT REVIEW - NEW ITEM

5. 11 ANACAPA ST

(5:10) Assessor's Parcel Number: 033-112-010
Application Number: MST2017-00009
Owner: Richlor Living Trust
Architect: Henry Lenny

(Proposal for a new restaurant in the Coastal Zone. Project includes the conversion of existing fabrication shop for a new 2,521 square-foot restaurant and bar use. A remodel will be done to the front façade of this 11,847 square-foot multi-tenant building, a new 1,834 square-foot dining patio will be built, and the existing parking lot will be reconfigured.)

(Action may be taken if sufficient information is provided. Item was last reviewed February 27, 2017.)

Actual time: 5:25 p.m.

Present: Henry Lenny, Henry Lenny Design Studio; and Marie Biaggi, Junior Designer, DMHA

Public comment opened at 5:45 p.m., and as no one wished to speak, it closed.

Motion: Continued to the July 3 agenda with comments:
1. Study reproducing the proportions of the openings and other features on the conceptual elevation that was presented at the previous meeting.
2. Study more closely replicating the steel connections and adjacencies at the corner windows, headers and detailing.
3. Study alternate locations for the trash enclosure.
4. The Concrete Masonry Unit wall should be plaster to match the patina of the building.
GOALS

- **Resource Allocation**: Achieve a balance in the amount, location and type of growth within the context of available resources including water, energy, food, housing, and transportation.

- **Character**: Maintain the small town character of Santa Barbara as a unique and desirable place to live, work, and visit.

- **Design**: Protect and enhance the community’s character with appropriately sized and scaled buildings, a walkable town, useable and well-located open space, and abundant, sustainable landscaping.

- **Historic Preservation**: Protect, preserve and enhance the City’s historic resources.

Growth Management and Resource Allocation Policies

LG1. Resource Allocation Priority. Prioritize the use of available resources capacities for additional affordable housing for extremely low, very low, low, moderate, and middle income households over all other new development.

Land Use Policies

LG4. Principles for Development. Establish the following Principles for Development to focus growth, encourage a mix of land uses, strengthen mobility options and promote healthy active living.

- **Focus Growth**: Encourage workforce and affordable housing within a quarter mile of frequent transit service and commercial services through smaller units and increased density, transit resources, parking demand standards, targeted infrastructure improvements, and increased public areas and open space. Incorporate ideas as a result of an employee survey.

- **Mix of Land Uses**: Encourage a mix of land uses, particularly in the Downtown to maintain its strength as a viable commercial center, to include retail, office, restaurant, residential, institutional, financial and cultural arts, encourage easy access to basic needs such as groceries, drug stores, community services, recreation, and public space.

- **Mobility and Active Living**: Link mixed-use development with main transit lines; promote active living by encouraging compact, vibrant, walkable places; encourage the use of bicycles; and reduce the need for residential parking.

LG6. Location of Residential Growth. Encourage new residential units in multi-family and commercial areas of the City with the highest densities to be located in the Downtown, La Cumbre Plaza/Five Points area and along Milpas Street.
Possible Implementation Actions to be Considered

LG6.3 Priority Housing Overlay. Encourage the construction of rental and employer housing and limited equity co-operatives in select multi-family and commercial zones where residential use is allowed by providing increased density (over Average Unit-Size Density Incentive Program).

LG6.7 Housing for Downtown Workers. Encourage affordable housing projects by expediting and facilitating downtown housing construction that includes provisions prioritizing downtown workers to the extent legally possible.

Housing Element (2011)

GOALS

- **Housing Opportunities:** Ensure a full range of housing opportunities for all persons regardless of race, religion, sex, age, marital status, sexual orientation, ancestry, national origin, color or economic status, with special emphasis on providing housing opportunities for low income, moderate, middle income and special needs households.

- **New Housing Development:** Encourage the production of new housing opportunities which are sustainable, and increase equity by providing a sufficiently wide range in type and affordability to meet the needs of all economic and social groups, with special emphasis on housing that meets the needs of extremely low, very low, low, moderate, middle income and special needs households.

Housing Opportunities Policies

H2. Housing Opportunities. Promote equal housing opportunities for all segments of the community, with special emphasis given to extremely low, very low, low, moderate, middle income and special needs households.

New Housing Development Policies

H10. New Housing. Given limited remaining land resources, the City shall encourage the development of housing on vacant infill sites and the redevelopment of opportunity sites both in residential zones, and as part of mixed-use development in commercial zones.

Possible Implementation Actions to be Considered

H10.3 Building Reuse. Encourage residential reuse of existing nonresidential buildings, for both ownership and rental affordable housing.

H11. Promote Affordable Units. The production of affordable housing units shall be the highest priority and the City will encourage all opportunities to construct new housing units that are affordable to extremely low, very low, low, moderate and middle income owners and renters.
Possible Implementation Actions to be Considered

H11.2 Priority Housing Overlay. Encourage the construction of rental housing, employer sponsored housing, and co-operative housing in the Downtown, La Cumbre Plaza/Five Points area, C-M Commercial Manufacturing Zone and Milpas Street area by providing incentives such as:

- Increased density overlays up to 63 du/ac as part of the Average Unit-Size Density Incentive Program.
- Higher Floor Area Ratios (FAR) when such standards are developed.
- More flexibility with zoning standards, (e.g., reduced parking standards).
- Expedited Design Review process.
- Fee waivers or deferrals.

H17. Flexible Standards. Implement changes to development standards to be more flexible for rental, employer sponsored workforce housing, affordable housing projects, and limited equity co-operatives, where appropriate.

Possible Implementation Actions to be Considered

H17.1 Parking Requirements. Consider incremental changes to the Zoning Ordinance parking requirements such as:

- Reducing parking requirements for projects that develop under the Average Unit-Size Density Incentive Program to 1 space minimum per unit.
- Allowing tandem parking
- Providing more flexibility for constrained sites (e.g., allowing for more than one maneuver, use of car stacking devices or other space saving measures)
- Eliminating guest parking requirements for housing in the Downtown commercial area
- Rounding down when calculating parking requirements

H17.2 Zoning Standards. Consider amending the Zoning Ordinance to change how, where and the extent of outdoor living space, yard and setback requirements for housing in commercial zones.

Environmental Resources Element (2011)

GOALS

- Sustainable Resource Use. Protect and use natural resources wisely to sustain their quantity and quality, minimize hazards to people and property, and meet present and future service, health and environmental needs.

- Reduce Greenhouse Gases. Reduce where practicable greenhouse gas emissions contributions to climate change, and to air pollution and related health risks.
RELEVANT GOALS, POLICIES, & IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES
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- Climate Change Adaptation. If applicable, incorporate adaptation to climate change in proposals for new development, redevelopment and public infrastructure.

Aesthetics and Visual Resources Policies

ER29. Visual Resources Protection. New development or redevelopment shall preserve or enhance important public views and viewpoints for public enjoyment, where such protection would not preclude reasonable development of a property.

Possible Implementation Actions to be Considered

ER29.2 Evaluation Criteria. In evaluating public scenic views and development impacts at a particular location, the City shall consider:

a. The importance of the existing view (i.e., whether a view contains one or more important visual resources, has scenic qualities, and is viewed from a heavily used public viewpoint, such as public gathering area, major public transportation corridor or area of intensive pedestrian and bicycle use);

b. Whether a proposed change in the existing view would be individually or cumulatively significant (i.e., substantially degrade or obstruct existing important public scenic views, or impair the visual context of the Waterfront area or designated historic resource);

c. Whether changes in the proposed action could be avoided or adequately reduced through project design changes (such as site lay-out, building design, and landscape design).

AIR QUALITY

Policies

1.0 Reduce single occupant automobile trips and increase the utilization of public transit.

2.0 Improve the attractiveness and safety of bicycle use as an alternate mode of travel for short- and medium-distance trips.

Circulation Element (1997, original 1964)

GENERAL PLAN CONSISTENCY

13.1 The City shall integrate the goals of this Circulation Element with land use decisions.
13.1.1 Encourage the development of projects that combine and locate residential uses near areas of employment and services.

13.1.2 Continue to require the review of proposed projects for consistency with the Goals and Policies of the General Plan.

DESIGN STANDARDS

13.4.2 Ensure that all City design guidelines orient buildings toward pedestrian activities through such methods as:

- Commercial Areas:
  - creating attractive, interesting, and pleasing building facades that are oriented toward paseos, streets and sidewalks,
  - reducing or eliminating setbacks for non-residential or mixed use buildings,
  - placing parking lots behind buildings or underground, if feasible,
  - encouraging shared parking facilities,
  - incorporating paths and paseos between adjacent properties as new development, redevelopment and infill development occurs,
  - screening equipment and materials storage from public view,
  - incorporating lighting, seating, landscaping, newsracks, shade structures, etc., and
  - creating landscaped open spaces.

NEIGHBORHOOD SERVING USES

13.5 Determine the need for residential neighborhood services and commercial uses that support the City’s mobility goals. Provide opportunities to address those needs, while preserving and protecting the neighborhood character.

13.5.1 Allow small scale neighborhood serving commercial uses in residential areas if supported by affected property owners. Ensure that the character of the surrounding neighborhood is protected.
Attachment 3: The site plan for 401-409 E Haley Avenue have been distributed separately.

A copy of the plans is available for viewing at the Planning and Zoning Counter, 630 Garden Street, Santa Barbara, CA between the hours of 8:30 A.M and 4:30 P.M. Monday through Thursday, and every other Friday. Please check our website under City Calendar to verify closure dates.