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I. PROJECT DESCRIPTION  

Proposal for a 52-unit mixed-use project with 6,084 square feet of nonresidential floor area to be developed under the Average Unit-Size Density (AUD) Incentive Program on eight parcels known as 226-232 E. Anapamu Street, 1117 & 1121 Garden Street and 223 E. Figueroa Street, Units G & H. The project includes a voluntary lot merger to create a 35,958 square foot lot.

The proposal includes demolishing all existing improvements, except two Queen Anne Free Classic style homes located on E. Anapamu Street that were constructed in 1905 and are eligible to be designated as Structures of Merit. These two structures are proposed to be relocated to Garden Street and incorporated into the project.

The project proposes to construct a 63,982 square foot, three- and four-story mixed-use development that includes 39,092 square feet of residential area, 6,084 square feet of commercial area, 11,545 square feet of parking garage and 3,653 square feet of circulation area. The development would be composed of three new detached buildings and the two relocated one-story Queen Anne buildings. Seventy-two parking spaces would be provided in an underground parking garage with access from Garden Street. Of these 72 spaces, 12 spaces would be allocated to the commercial development and 60 would be allocated to the residential development. The majority of the parking spaces would be provided in parking machines. The residential component of the project includes 52 residential units with an average unit size of 752 square feet and a unit mix of studios, one-bedroom, two-bedroom and three-bedroom units. Proposed residential lobby and amenity space would total 1,245 square feet.

The eight affected parcels have a zoning classification of O-R (Office Restricted) and a General Plan Land Use designation of Office/ High Residential (28-36 du/ac)/ Priority Housing Overlay (37-63 du/ac). The proposed density on the lots totaling 35,958 square feet would be 63 dwelling units per acre.

A Phase 1 Historic Structures/Sites Report, including a Cultural Landscape Report, was prepared to evaluate all structures on the site. A Phase 2 Historic Structures/Sites Report will be required to evaluate the impacts of the proposed project on the potential historic resources.
The project will require approval of a Development Plan by the Historic Landmarks Commission for the construction of 2,999 square feet of net new nonresidential floor area.

The applicant has also discussed the potential of doing a density bonus project on the project site, and additional information on that potential is in their Applicant Letter (Exhibit A).

**Vicinity Map:** 226-232 E. Anapamu St., 1117 & 1121 Garden St., and 223 E. Figueroa St. G & H

### II. CONCEPT REVIEW

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 Priority Housing Overlay (SBMC §30.150.060.A). 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 Historic Landmarks Commission (HLC) with comments on the proposed design and improvements, and General Plan consistency (SBMC §30.150.060.E).

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 HLC for use in their deliberations on the project.

III. BACKGROUND

A. DESIGN REVIEW

This project has been reviewed by the HLC on several occasions. Initially, the project was reviewed on March 22, 2018 and April 19, 2017, prior to preparation of a Historic Structures and Sites Report (HSSR). At those meetings, the HLC expressed concern about the project’s size, bulk and scale, particularly the fourth story and the portion adjacent to the Figueroa Street bungalows (refer to Exhibits C and D).

On May 17, 2017, the HLC reviewed a Phase 1 HSSR and continued the report for significant revisions (Exhibit E), particularly related to the discussion of the courtyard housing on Figueroa Street. On June 28, 2017, the HLC reviewed a revised Phase 1 HSSR and continued the report to address the HLC’s comments (Exhibit F). On August 23, 2017, the HLC reviewed the Phase 1 HSSR again and continued the Report so that it could include analysis of the cultural landscape (Exhibit G). On April 4, 2018, the HLC reviewed and accepted the Phase 1 HSSR and Cultural Landscape Study.

On April 4, 2018, the HLC also reviewed the design of the project again. At that hearing the HLC expressed continued concern with the size, bulk and scale of the project, and stated that the architecture needs to be more residential in style and form (Exhibit H).

On May 16, 2018, the HLC reviewed a more conceptual massing plan for a modified project. The HLC appreciated the reduction in building height and overall size, but found that the size, bulk and scale of the project remained incompatible with the neighborhood (Exhibit I).

On June 27, 2018, the HLC reviewed the current version of the project and continued the project to the Planning Commission for AUD Concept review (Exhibit J). At that meeting, HLC members commented on how far the project had come since the initial review. Nevertheless, the HLC found that the size, bulk and scale of the project were not acceptable in this location. They continue to have concerns about the amount of open space and landscaping provided. The HLC also noted that although the project may be consistent with the AUD Ordinance, there are neighborhood concerns about parking, traffic and residential density. The HLC was supportive of allowing a Craftsman-style architecture for the building facing Figueroa Street as an appropriate response to an adjacent historic resource. However, staff is still researching whether there is a mechanism to allow this deviation from architecture in the “Hispanic tradition” for a new building (refer to Exhibit K for applicable excerpt from Municipal Code).

B. PRT REVIEW

The project was reviewed by the City’s Pre-Application Review Team (PRT) in June-July 2017 (refer to Exhibit L). The PRT letter identified areas of concern, as well as items that will need to be addressed prior to application completeness and environmental review, such as demonstration of feasible implementation of Storm Water Management Program requirements, identifying tree removals, and a complete assessment of the project’s impacts on historic resources.

The project plans have been modified since the PRT review in the following ways:
The amount of nonresidential floor area was reduced to less than 3,000 square feet, thereby eliminating the need for a Development Application Review Team application. This means the HLC, not the Planning Commission, is the decision-maker on the Development Plan request.

The project’s vehicular access was moved from Anapamu Street to Garden Street. A short driveway access remains on Anapamu for trash collection and loading/unloading associated with deliveries and move-ins/outs.

The amount of commercial parking required and provided was reduced as a result of the New Zoning Ordinance (NZO) expanding the Central Business District to include the subject block. This reduced the parking requirement from 1 space per 250 square feet to 1 space per 500 square feet. The NZO also amended the required residential parking such that required residential accessible parking would be in addition to the one space per unit residential parking requirement.

The parking garage was redesigned from two levels of underground parking to one level of underground parking through use of parking lifts/stackers for the majority of the parking spaces. This also reduced the amount of grading by almost 8,000 cubic yards.

After the PRT letter was issued, the City adopted the New Zoning Ordinance (Title 30). An updated zoning analysis is provided below.

IV. SITE INFORMATION AND PROJECT STATISTICS

A. SITE INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant:</th>
<th>Melisa Turner, DesignArc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property Owners:</td>
<td>Barranca Enterprises, Inc. and MLG Leasing, Inc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Information</th>
<th>Address:</th>
<th>Lot Area:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parcel Number:</td>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>35,958 sf total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>029-162-006</td>
<td>226 E. Anapamu St.</td>
<td>11,243 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>029-162-007</td>
<td>228 E. Anapamu St.</td>
<td>3,500 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>029-162-008</td>
<td>230 E. Anapamu St.</td>
<td>3,500 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>029-162-009</td>
<td>232 E. Anapamu St.</td>
<td>3,498 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>029-162-010</td>
<td>1121 Garden St.</td>
<td>4,408 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>029-162-012</td>
<td>1117 Garden St.</td>
<td>4,491 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>029-162-020</td>
<td>223 E. Figueroa St. H</td>
<td>2,340 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>029-162-021</td>
<td>223 E. Figueroa St. G</td>
<td>2,798 sf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Plan:</th>
<th>Office – High Density Residential (28-36 du/ac) / Priority Housing Overlay (37-63 du/ac)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zoning:</td>
<td>O-R (Office Restricted)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Use:</th>
<th>Office and Residential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topography:</th>
<th>5% slope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adjacent Land Uses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. PROJECT STATISTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Units</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>3,085 sf</td>
<td>6,084 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor Area Ratio</td>
<td>15,300 / 35,958 = 0.425</td>
<td>51,121 / 35,958 = 1.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. POLICY AND ZONING CONSISTENCY ANALYSIS

A. ZONING ORDINANCE CONSISTENCY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard (SBMC Ch. 30.150)</th>
<th>Requirement/ Allowance</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Unit Density</td>
<td>37-63 du/ac</td>
<td>63 du/ac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Units</td>
<td>30-52 units</td>
<td>52 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Average Unit Size</td>
<td>970-811 sf</td>
<td>752 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setbacks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Front</td>
<td>5 feet (variable)</td>
<td>5 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Interior</td>
<td>0 feet</td>
<td>&gt;5 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Height</td>
<td>45 feet</td>
<td>45 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking – Vehicle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Residential</td>
<td>52 spaces + ADA</td>
<td>52 + 2 ADA spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Commercial</td>
<td>12 (1 per 500 sf)</td>
<td>64 Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>= 64 Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking – Bicycle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Residential</td>
<td>52 spaces</td>
<td>52 spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Commercial</td>
<td>3 spaces (2 long-term, 1 short-term)</td>
<td>8 spaces (6 long-term, 2 short-term)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Yard</td>
<td>5,394 sf (15% of lot area)</td>
<td>5,412 sf (15% of lot area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Coverage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Building</td>
<td>12,938 sf 36%</td>
<td>23,370 sf 65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Paving/Driveway</td>
<td>18,149 sf 50%</td>
<td>4,950 sf 14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Landscaping</td>
<td>4,871 sf 14%</td>
<td>7,638 sf 21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes electric vehicle charging stations.

As identified in the Table above and discussed in more detail below, the proposed development would be consistent with requirements of the Zoning Ordinance.

The project is proposed under the City’s AUD Program, which allows up to 63 dwelling units per acre with a maximum average unit size of 811 square feet under the Priority Housing Density requirements. At 0.825 acres, the subject property can have up to 52 units with an average unit
size of 811 square feet. The project proposes 39,092 square feet of residential apartment development, with 6,084 square feet of commercial space, and an 11,545 square foot parking garage. The residential development would include 52 units, with an average unit size of 752 square feet. The Priority Housing Overlay density allowance is contingent upon the project being developed and maintained 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.

The surrounding area is comprised of one, two, and three story development (refer to Exhibit B, Sheet A001 for a context plan). The AUD ordinance allows buildings up to four stories and 45 feet tall. The proposed project would have four stories and would not exceed 45 feet, and would therefore comply with zoning height requirements. Much of the development would be three stories, with a height closer to approximately 33-40 feet. The portion of the development closest to Figueroa Street is proposed as two-stories with a height of approximately 18 feet to be more compatible with the existing cottages located at 223 E. Figueroa Street.

The project complies with all setback requirements. The AUD Program requires a 5-foot variable setback from the front property lines, and does not require a setback from interior property lines adjacent to nonresidential zones. The project is proposing setbacks of at least five feet from all property lines, with the exception of the underground parking garage.

The project proposes to use the Alternative Open Yard Design (30.150.090.G.2.b.iii.) available to AUD projects in nonresidential zones, which requires the provision of 15% of the lot area as common outdoor area. The project provides a total of 5,412 square feet (15%) of common outdoor area, with common areas located on the ground and on the roof, which complies with the common outdoor area requirement. In addition to the 15% required common outdoor area, the project provides private yards/decks for some of the units.

The AUD Program requires one parking space per residential unit, plus any additional accessible parking required by the building code (SBMC §§30.150.090.F and 30.175.030.I.1). There is no requirement for covered parking under the AUD Program. The project site is located in the Central Business District but is not within a designated Zone of Benefit, so required commercial parking is 1 space per 500 net square feet (SBMC §30.175.050.B). Per the City’s Zoning Ordinance, parking spaces can be replaced with electric vehicle charging stations (EVCS) on a one-to-one basis (SBMC §30.175.050.I). The proposed project provides 69 parking spaces and 3 EVCS, all of which are covered. Consistent with the Zoning Ordinance, the residential units would have 50 standard parking spaces, 2 EVCS and 2 accessible parking spaces. The commercial tenant would have 10 standard parking spaces, 1 EVCS and 1 accessible parking space. Six additional (surplus) parking spaces are provided in the parking lift. For additional discussion of the parking design, please refer to section C.2 below.

Covered and secured bicycle parking for residents is provided in a bicycle parking room at the ground floor (52 spaces), and covered and secured long-term bicycle parking for the commercial use is provided at the ground floor (6 spaces). An additional two short-term bicycle parking spaces are provided the commercial use. The proposed bicycle parking is consistent with Ordinance requirements (SBMC §§30.150.090.F and 30.175.040).
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 Attachment 1 of Exhibit L. 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. As identified by staff in the PRT Letter (Exhibit L), staff finds that the project is potentially consistent with some General Plan policies and potentially inconsistent with others.

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 63 dwelling units per acre, the maximum allowed, and would add 52 rental units to the City’s housing stock by using the City’s AUD Program and Priority Housing Overlay in the Downtown area.

The Land Use Element also calls for enhancement of community character (Policy LG12, Community Character) and includes an implementation action (LG12.2, Building Size, Bulk and Scale) to ensure that proposed buildings are compatible in scale with the surrounding built environment, particularly adjacent to historic structures.

The project is proposed along a commercial corridor and is centrally located near many commercial uses and public transit that could serve the residents. However, the project is also located on a street (Garden Street) that has low-scale residential development along the east side. The proposed development is also adjacent to one-story bungalows located to the south off of Figueroa Street. While this is an appropriate location for high-density housing, the development must ensure compatibility with surrounding development.

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 52 new rental units, consisting of 15 studio, 9 one-bedroom, 24 two-bedroom, and 4 three-bedroom units, consistent with Housing Element policies.

3. HISTORIC RESOURCES ELEMENT

The Historic Resources Element includes multiple policies and implementation strategies encouraging the preservation and enhancement of historic resources. The project would maintain (relocate) the two Queen Anne buildings, which would be consistent with Policy HR3, which discourages demolition of historic resources and could be consistent with the policy to pursue adaptive reuse (Policy HR4).

A Phase 1 Historic Structures and Site Report and Cultural Landscape Study were prepared for the project (Exhibits M and N). These Reports were ultimately accepted by the HLC on April 4, 2018. The Reports identified the following as potentially significant:
• Queen Anne Cottages at 228 and 230 E. Anapamu Street are eligible for listing as Structures of Merit.¹
• Cottages at 223A, 223B, 223D² and 223F¹ E. Figueroa Street are eligible for listing as Structures of Merit (not a part of project site).
• Hitching posts in parkway in front of 232 E. Anapamu Street.
• Clusters of historic resources at 224, 228, 230 and 234 E. Figueroa Street (not a part of project site).
• Clusters of historic resources at 1116, 1122, 1124 and 1134 Garden Street (not a part of project site).

A Phase 2 HSSR is required to analyze the proposed project’s impact on the identified historic resources in the area. That report will provide more information as to whether the project is consistent with Historic Resources Element policies related to compatibility of development and respect for historic context (Policy HR2), and protection of neighborhood and streetscape historic resources (Policies HR5 and HR6).

As noted in the attached HLC Minutes and PRT Letter, the City’s Urban Historian has recommended that the two Queen Anne buildings remain together (physically adjacent) to maintain their integrity of association. Although there is an existing one-story building that would be located between the two Queen Anne buildings as proposed, that structure has not been deemed historically significant, and could be demolished in the future, thereby breaking up the one-story streetscape that is currently shown.

Until completion of the Phase 2 HSSR, staff cannot take a position on the project’s consistency with the Historic Resources Element of the General Plan.

4. ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES ELEMENT

The Environmental Resources Element (inclusive of the Conservation Element) includes policies (ER29, Visual Resources Protection and ER30, Enhance Visual Quality) to protect and enhance visual resources. 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 core where views of the mountains or beach are not readily available from the public street due to existing development. The proposed project would introduce a new four-story structure into an area currently developed with one-, two-, and three-story structures; therefore, the project would not significantly alter views to public resources.

5. CIRCULATION ELEMENT

The Circulation Element includes multiple policies and implementation strategies to encourage alternative modes of transportation.

The project site is located in the Central Business District and would be very close to Line 2 (East) bus stops on Anapamu Street, Line 14 (Montecito) bus stops on Figueroa and Garden, and within five blocks of the Transit Center.

¹ Added to the City’s Potential Historic Resource list April 4, 2018.
² Designated as a Structure of Merit April 18, 2018.
The Bicycle Master Plan calls for enhanced Class 3 bikeways along E. Anapamu Street with green-backed sharrows. The project site is three blocks away from the Class 2 bike lane along State Street and there is a morning southbound peak hour bikeway along Garden adjacent to the project site. The project would provide covered and secure bicycle parking for the residents and separate commercial bike parking (C7.7, Bicycle Parking and Other Needs).

C. PROJECT DESIGN

1. NEIGHBORHOOD COMPATIBILITY

The HLC Ordinance (SBMC §22.22.145) outlines certain criteria that the HLC 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 HLC has not made favorable comments regarding the appropriateness of the proposed project, including the massing, scale, and open space of the design. The HLC did state that the architecture was generally compatible with the neighborhood, and that views were not affected.

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 HLC in their review of the project.

2. PARKING DESIGN

The City Council adopted updated Access & Parking Design Standards on June 19, 2018. Revisions to the project are necessary to conform to the standards. Parking machines are only appropriate for non-residential uses that have frequent, long-duration users (e.g., office) or valet service (e.g., hotel). Not enough information has been provided to determine whether the non-residential parking is appropriate. The updated standards require that a minimum of 25% of non-residential parking be provided outside of parking machines. The project does not currently meet that requirement. The configuration of
the parking machines does not allow for vehicles in surplus parking spaces 4-8 to exit those spaces in one maneuver. Staff does not support the 15 foot depth of the driveway on Anapamu to access the trash room because loading, unloading, or parking in that driveway will block the sidewalk. Additional details will be needed to review the bicycle parking.

3. **EASEMENTS**

The two parcels located at 223 E. Figueroa, G and H (APN 029-162-020 and -021) appear to have adjacent five-foot easements for ingress/egress and public utilities, which result in a 10-foot easement down the middle of those parcels (between the two existing cottages). The project proposes to demolish those cottages and construct a new building over the easements. Additional research will be required to determine the authority of the project applicant to proceed with this aspect of the project proposal.

**VI. NEXT STEPS**

Following the Planning Commission concept review, the applicant must submit a complete project application and staff would commence environmental review. This will include the Phase 2 HSSR and additional information about tree removal and storm water management. Once the project is deemed complete and an environmental determination has been made, the project would return to HLC for a decision regarding Project Design and Development Plan approval. The project as proposed is not required to return to the Planning Commission.

Exhibits:

A. Applicant's letter, dated July 9, 2018
B. Project Plans
C. HLC Minutes dated March 22, 2017
D. HLC Minutes dated April 19, 2017
E. HLC Minutes dated May 17, 2017
F. HLC Minutes dated June 28, 2017
G. HLC Minutes dated August 23, 2017
H. HLC Minutes dated April 4, 2018
I. HLC Minutes dated May 16, 2018
J. Draft HLC Minutes dated June 27, 2018
K. SBMC §22.22.104 Required Architectural Styles
L. PRT Letter dated July 11, 2017, including Applicable General Plan Policies

The following Exhibits are available electronically:

M. Historic Structures/Sites Report Phase 1 prepared by Alexandra Cole and dated March 2018
N. Cultural Landscape Study prepared by Post/Hazeltine Associates and dated March 26, 2018
July 9, 2018

Planning Department
C/o Allison DeBusk
City of Santa Barbara
630 Garden St.
Santa Barbara, CA 93101

Address: 226 E Anapamu St
Case #: MST2017-00092
Zone: O-R Zone / Office / High Residential Priority Overlay (37-63 du/acre)
APN: 029-162-005, -007, -008, -009, -010, -012, -020, -021
RE: Applicant Letter for AUD Project ~ Planning Commission 07/19/18

Dear Ms. Allison DeBusk:

On behalf of the Applicant, Barranca Enterprises LLC, DesignARC is submitting the following packet for a Planning Commission Concept Review, as required for the proposed mixed-use development at 226 E Anapamu Street consisting of (52) residential apartments under the Average Unit Density (AUD) program, and 6,084 square feet of commercial/office use.

The project is comprised of a voluntary lot merger of eight properties for a total of 35,958 square feet, the preservation and relocation of the two existing Queen Anne residences from Anapamu St to Garden St, and the construction of a new three-story mixed-use apartment complex with (15) studios, (9) one-bedroom units, (24) two-bedroom units, and (4) three-bedroom units, with an average unit size of 751 square feet. The proposed density on the parcel will be 63 dwelling units per acre, where the land use allows for 37-63 dwelling units per acre.

Project also includes a 72 space parking garage with mechanical stackers, consisting of 52 residential parking, 12 spaces for commercial/office uses, and 8 surplus parking. The proposed parking will accommodate 1 space for each residential unit, as per the AUD ordinance, for a total of 52 spaces. The remaining balance of 20 spaces would be for commercial and guests during the day and would be available for residents’ guests in the evenings and weekends after business hours.

The project has received five conceptual reviews at the Historic Landmarks Commission (HLC) and a PRT review from City staff. Revisions to the drawings to date have been made to address the specified concerns raised by the HLC and staff comments, which resulted in major massing and architectural revisions:

- The elimination of the 4th story massing along Garden St, which reduced the East elevation building height by 10.5 ft.
- The division of a single large L-shaped building into a series of four buildings with a variety of Architectural typologies, creating a village of distinct buildings: Spanish Colonial, Monterrey, Classic Mediterranean, and Craftsman Architecture,
- The loss of approximately 6,000 square feet of building area.

EXHIBIT A
• The reduction in the average unit size,
• The revision to unit mix and program areas,
• The elimination of the rooftop residential lounge,
• The redesign of the basement garage to a semi-automated parking garage with stackers, which reduced excavation and building height
• The reduction in ceiling heights within the units and in the commercial suites, which significantly reduced the building height,
• Further on-grade setbacks along Anapamu and Garden Streets, as well as around the motor court units and Queen Anne residences,
• The addition of two Paseos through Anapamu and Garden street, improving the connection and pedestrian experience to the interior courtyards,
• The reduction of building height on the Anapamu and Garden Street corner to 2-stories with third floor stepped back,
• The overall simplification of architectural expression,
• Improving site planning, hardscape and landscaping on the various courtyards and rooftop deck, and
• Minor interior programmatic revisions with the location of the lobby entrance, bicycle and trash room.

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 before the project can receive a Project Design Approval at Historic Landmarks Commission.

In addition to the proposed project, the applicant would like Planning Commission to provide feedback on two alternative designs that would include deed-restricted Affordable units and employ the State Density Bonus law (Section 65915). Option 1 would include 10% low income units and a 20% density bonus (62 total units, 5 Affordable). Option 2 would include 35% density bonus and 20% low income units and (70 total units, 14 Affordable). Option 2 would be subject to unconditional approval under the State Housing Accountability Act (Section 65589.5). Both options would result in additional square footage and portions of the project to be 4 stories.

We look forward to receiving the Planning Commission comments and working towards our approvals with HLC. 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
DETERMINE AUD PROGRAM APPLICABILITY

Please consult with the Planning Staff for further information on the AUD Program.

AUD PROGRAM APPLICABILITY TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Designation</th>
<th>Project Size (AC)</th>
<th>Project Size (SF)</th>
<th>Number of Units</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Residential Class A</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Residential Class B</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed-Use Mixed-Use Class A</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: The above table is for illustrative purposes only and may not represent actual project sizes.

AUD CALCULATOR FORMS

N.G.M.P. ANALYSIS

Existing Commercial Uses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Commercial Use</th>
<th>SF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>200 ft Amusement Park</td>
<td>1,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230 ft Amusement Park</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232 ft Amusement Park</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposed Commercial Uses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Commercial Use</th>
<th>SF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>200 ft Amusement Park</td>
<td>1,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230 ft Amusement Park</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,980</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Net Increase of Commercial Use: 580 SF

MIXED-USE A.U.D. DEVELOPMENT

6005 DESIGNARC

6005 DESIGNARC

6005 DESIGNARC
MIXED-USE A.U.D. DEVELOPMENT

FOURTH / ROOF PLAN

DESIGNARC
NORTH ELEVATION (ANAPAMU STREET)
MISSIONARY TIE DOWN
ALUMINUM CLAD
WOOD WINDOWS

SOUTH ELEVATION

MIXED-USE A.U.D. DEVELOPMENT
BUILDING 3 PARTIAL ELEVATIONS

MIXED-USE A.U.D. DEVELOPMENT

WEST

45' 0" HEIGHT LIMIT

SOUTH

45' 0" HEIGHT LIMIT

DESIGNARC

A204.2

EXTERIOR ELEVATIONS

LONDON & MANCHESTER STREET, SAN BABAR, CALIFORNIA

JUNE 27, 2014
SECTION 2

MIXED-USE A.U.D. DEVELOPMENT

BUILDING SECTIONS A302
DESIGNARC
PERSPECTIVE: STREET VIEW FROM FIGUEROA

PERSPECTIVE: VIEW FROM WEST AT POLICE PARKING
CONCEPT REVIEW - NEW

4. 226-232 E ANAPAMU ST; 1121 & 1117 GARDEN ST; 223 E FIGUEROA ST H; 223 E FIGUEROA ST G  
   R-O Zone

(2:20) Assessor’s Parcel Numbers: 029-162-006, -007, -008, -009, -010, -012, -020  
   029-161-021
   Application Number: MST2017-00092
   Owner: Barranca Enterprises, Inc.
   Architect: DesignARC

(Project site contains twin Queen Anne Free Classic style homes constructed in 1905 that are  
eligible to be designated as Structures of Merit. Proposal for a new mixed-use  
apartment/commercial structure using the Average Unit-Size Density Incentive Program. The  
project will comprise a voluntary lot merger of eight parcels (APNs 029-162-006, 029-162-007,  
includes demolishing all existing improvements, except the twin Queen Anne Free Classic style  
homes, which will be relocated to the Garden Street Frontage to provide better context for the  
early 19th century buildings, and constructing a new four-story apartment/commercial building.  
The unit mix will be 24 one-bedroom apartments, 22 two-bedroom apartments, and 6 three-  
bedroom apartments, for a total of 52 residential units, and an average unit size of 809 square  
feet per unit. Also proposed are 87 parking spaces provided in a new 34,079 square foot, two-  
level basement parking garage, and 52 bike parking spaces. Project is within the Priority Housing  
Overlay (37-63 du/ac). A Historic Structures/Sites Report will be required to evaluate all  
structures on the site and to evaluate the impacts of the proposed project on the potential historic  
resources. Project also requires review by Planning Commission.)

(Comments Only.)

Actual time: 2:25 p.m.
Present: Greg Reitz, Developer, Rethink Development; and Mark Shields, Melisa Turner, and Mark Kirkhart, DesignARC

Staff comments: Ms. Hernandez stated that she met with the applicants and historian Alexandra Cole, who will prepare the Historic Structures/Sites Report (HSSR). The main issue is how to build around the existing twin Queen Anne Free Classic style homes in the Spanish Colonial Revival style required in El Pueblo Viejo. They had a preliminary discussion about relocating the homes together on the same lot to face Garden Street, as it contains other late-nineteenth and early-twentieth-century buildings and reads as a residential neighborhood, whereas Anapamu Street has developed with more commercial, Spanish Colonial Revival buildings. Ms. Hernandez recommended moving the houses together, as they read well side-by-side as twins. The HSSR will provide more information in its evaluation of all buildings on the site.

Public comment opened at 2:57 p.m.

The following people spoke in opposition or with concerns:
1. Steve Hoegerman, nearby resident, submitted a letter and spoke of concerns about size, bulk, and scale; demolishing the cottages; protection of the courtyard; and parking.
2. Theron Kontos, nearby resident, echoed Mr. Hoegerman’s comments about the impact of the project on the area, and expressed concern about foot traffic through the courtyard.
3. Tom Kapernekas, representing the owner of a nearby property, stated that the cottages should remain as a cohesive eight, and commented on the lack of sunlight that the new development will cause.
4. Nonie Hamilton, nearby resident, stated that the proposal is not compatible with the neighborhood, and she is opposed to the encroachment into courtyard and demolishing the two cottages.
5. Josephine Di Loreto’s letter with concerns was read into the record, and Ms. Di Loreto emphasized the proposal’s size and its encroachment into the cottages.
6. Kellam de Forest wondered about the history of the block and the courtyard, and commented on the height of the project and the canyonization of Anapamu Street.
7. Correspondence from JoAnn Chenovick with concerns was read into the record.

The following people spoke in support:
1. Addison Proctor emphasized the lack of housing in the City and encouraged urban infill.
2. Gilbert Garcia expressed support for high-density housing in the City and stated that the project’s massing is sensitive to the surrounding neighborhood.
3. Christos Celmayster emphasized the housing shortage in the City and stated that the proposal fits the AUD design and will help the downtown economy.
4. Ken Oplinger, Santa Barbara Chamber of Commerce, stated that the proposal meets the goals of the AUD program to provide housing to workers and is compatible with the neighborhood.
5. Steve Harrel stated that this project fulfills a housing need and expressed support for the architecture and the relocation of the Queen Anne homes to Garden Street.

Public comment closed at 3:21 p.m.

Commission comments:
1. A site visit is important to understand the building and context of the neighborhood.
2. The Commission requested that the Urban Historian evaluate the courtyard at 223 Figueroa Street for its historic significance.
3. The Commission will require a 3-D massing model of both the proposed building and the adjoining structures, and may require story poles to further evaluate impact.

4. The Commission is concerned about neighborhood compatibility and the proposal’s overwhelming the neighborhood.

5. A solar access study for the adjoining properties may be required.

6. The Commission expressed general support for relocation of the twin Queen Anne Free Classic style homes and looks forward to review of the HSSR.

7. The Commission expressed concern about the mass and scale of the four-story element.

8. The Commission expressed concern about the mass and scale of the portion adjacent to the bungalows; this two-story mass fills the site to the setbacks, which should be mitigated.

9. The Commission expressed concern about the density in this neighborhood and the livability of both the proposed units and the adjacent properties.

10. Study the composition of the building as it addresses the corner and the four-story element in the center.

11. The Commission expressed concern about the architectural language of portions of the building being appropriate to El Pueblo Viejo.

12. The Commission expressed concern about the lack of randomness, serendipity, and poetry in the building.

13. The motor court should be protected.

14. The Commission supported the amount of open space proposed but would like to see the buildings articulated and separated with generous paseos and perhaps a courtyard.

* THE COMMISSION RECESSED FROM 3:49 TO 3:59 P.M. *
CONCEPT REVIEW - CONTINUED

10. 226-232 E ANAPAMU ST; 1121 & 1117 GARDEN ST; 223 E FIGUEROA ST H; 223 E FIGUEROA ST G

R-O Zone

Assessor’s Parcel Number: 029-162-006, -007, -008, -009, -010, -012, -020
029-161-021

Application Number: MST2017-00092

Owner: Barranca Enterprises, Inc.

Architect: DesignARC

(Project site contains twin Queen Anne Free Classic style homes constructed in 1905 that are eligible to be designated as Structures of Merit. Proposal for a new mixed-use apartment/commercial structure using the Average Unit-Size Density Incentive Program. The project will comprise a voluntary lot merger of eight parcels (APNs 029-162-006, 029-162-007, 029-162-008,-029-162-009, 029-162-010, 029-162-012, 029-162-020, 029-162-021). Proposal includes demolishing all existing improvements, except the twin Queen Anne Free Classic style homes, which will be relocated to the Garden Street frontage to provide better context for the early-19th century buildings, and constructing a new four-story apartment/commercial building. The unit mix will be 24 one-bedroom apartments, 22 two-bedroom apartments, and 6 three-bedroom apartments, for a total of 52 residential units, and an average unit size of 809 square feet per unit. Also proposed are 87 parking spaces provided in a new 34,079 square foot, two-level basement parking garage, and 52 bike parking spaces. Project is within the Priority Housing Overlay (37-63 du/ac). A Historic Structures/Sites Report will be required to evaluate all structures on the site and to evaluate the impacts of the proposed project on the potential historic resources. Project also requires review by Planning Commission.)

(Comments Only; project requires Environmental Assessment and review by Planning Commission. Project was last reviewed on March 22, 2017.)

Actual time: 6:07 p.m.

Present: Greg Reitz, Developer, Rethink Development; and Mark Shields and Melisa Turner, DesignARC

Staff comments: Ms. Plummer stated that Ms. Hernandez, the Urban Historian, visited the courtyard and the two cottages proposed for demolition, and she concluded that they do not retain historical integrity due to alterations. Ms. Hernandez also maintains that the twin Queen Anne Free Classic style homes should be relocated together to maintain rhythm. However, the project requires a full Historic Structures/Sites Report for final conclusions.

EXHIBIT D
Public comment opened at 6:34 p.m.

The following people expressed support:
1. Steve Harrel, adjacent neighbor

The following people expressed opposition or concerns:
1. Steve Hoegerman emphasized the mass, bulk, and scale of the project and the impact on the cottages and courtyard.
2. Theron Kontos discussed parking problems and would like the courtyard kept intact.
3. Josephine Di Loreto stated that two cottages can be saved, and she is concerned about the scale of the project.
4. Correspondence from Patricia Chidlaw and Ben Sponser was acknowledged.

Public comment closed at 6:41 p.m.

Straw vote: How many Commissioners find the proposed size, bulk, and scale to be acceptable? 0/6 Failed

Motion: Continued four weeks with comments:
1. There is a strong desire to retain the two cottages, at least in their footprint and scale, at the end of the motor court.
2. The fourth story remains problematic for most Commissioners.
3. The open space provided in the middle of the block and the relocation of the two Queen Anne Free Classic style buildings remain supported by the Commission.
4. The architectural expression needs to be simplified.
5. The size, bulk, and scale need to be reduced.

Action: Mahan/Drury, 6/0/0. (Murray and Suding absent.) Motion carried.

* MEETING ADJOURNED AT 7:11 P.M. *
HISTORIC STRUCTURES REPORT

2. 226-232 E ANAPAMU ST; 1121 & 1117 GARDEN ST; 223 E FIGUEROA ST H; 223 E FIGUEROA ST G

R-O Zone

Assessor’s Parcel Number: 029-162-006, -007, -008, -009, -010, -012, -020
029-161-021

Application Number: MST2017-00092

Owner: Barranca Enterprises, Inc.

Architect: DesignARC

(Project site contains twin Queen Anne Free Classic style homes constructed in 1905 that are eligible to be designated as Structures of Merit. Proposal for a new mixed-use apartment/commercial structure using the Average Unit-Size Density Incentive Program. The project will comprise a voluntary lot merger of eight parcels (APNs 029-162-006, 029-162-007, 029-162-008, 029-162-009, 029-162-010, 029-162-012, 029-162-020, 029-162-021). Proposal includes demolishing all existing improvements, except the twin Queen Anne Free Classic style homes, which will be relocated to the Garden Street frontage to provide better context for the early 19th century buildings, and constructing a new four-story apartment/commercial building. The unit mix will be 24 one-bedroom apartments, 22 two-bedroom apartments, and 6 three-bedroom apartments, for a total of 52 residential units, and an average unit size of 809 square feet per unit. Also proposed are 87 parking spaces provided in a new 34,079 square foot, two-level basement parking garage, and 52 bike parking spaces. Project is within the Priority Housing Overlay (37-63 du/ac). A Historic Structures/Sites Report will be required to evaluate all structures on the site and to evaluate the impacts of the proposed project on the potential historic resources. Project also requires review by Planning Commission.)

(Review of Historic Structures/Sites Report prepared by Alexandra Cole. The report concluded that the buildings at 228 and 230 E. Anapamu Street are determined eligible to be designated as Structures of Merit for their Queen Anne Free Classic style. The eight houses in the motor court at 223 E. Figueroa Street were evaluated as to the integrity of the court as a whole; four of the cottages were considered significant as potential Structures of Merit (A, B, D, F), and four were not considered significant (C, E, G, H). The remaining buildings at 226 and 232 E. Anapamu Street, and 1117 and 1121 Garden Street, are not considered significant because their alterations have removed their historic integrity, and they no longer convey their original appearance or sense of time and place or period of significance from the 1880s to 1905.)

Actual time: 1:47 p.m.

Present: Alexandra Cole, Historian

EXHIBIT E
Staff comments: Ms. Hernandez stated that both she and Environmental Analyst, Barbara Shelton, reviewed the report and had extensive discussions with the historian based on the breadth of the report reviewing eight buildings. Although there were many details that the report did not expand upon, Ms. Hernandez agrees with the conclusions of the report that the project meets CEQA guidelines for findings of historic significance.

Public comment opened at 1:48 p.m.

The following people expressed opposition or concerns:
1. Josephine Di Loreto advised that she lives in one of the units recognized as “not significant” and disagreed with the evaluation as the bungalow has not been altered since it was built.
2. David Walker expressed that he appreciates the micro-community that currently exists and that the new project is out of scale and will destroy the integrity of the neighborhood.
3. Albertina Lourenci questioned who was responsible for transforming a historic neighborhood, which attracts tourist from all over the world, into any suburban-like landscape.
4. Steve Hoegerman expressed this proposal is too massive and will displace many.
5. Patricia Chidlaw expressed that the current bungalow structures make sense together in view of their configuration as a court of residences, and adding a huge apartment building next to these modestly scaled homes will be grotesquely out of proportion.
6. Ted Adelman expressed that this project will have a negative impact on the neighborhood street congestion, parking, and views.
7. Mary Wittmer expressed that this project is too big and will negatively change the dynamic of the neighborhood.
8. Marlee King spoke for nearby Villa Santa Barbara and expressed that this project is inappropriate for this quiet neighborhood and will diminish the ocean views of the residents of Villa Santa Barbara.
9. Correspondence from Chamise Morgenrath, Ariane Schmidt-Clausius, Tom Kapernekas, Paul Kontos, and Sasha Kapernekas was read into the record.

Public comment closed at 2:09 p.m.

Commission comments:
1. Commissioner Suding: On page 10 at the top of the page, the address should read 228 E. Anapamu Street, not 228 E. Anacapa. On page 11 at the top and bottom of the page, the address should read 230 and 232 East Anapamu Street, not Anacapa. Provide more photos of the altered windows on the houses in the court to demonstrate they have lost integrity. Review the document and replace the term “potential Structure of Merit” to “eligible to be designated.” Provide a brief discussion on the different types of courts and their historic significance to not only Santa Barbara but all of America.

2. Commissioner Mahan: Provide a map of the cottages labeled A-H. Expand the description of cottage C, on page 34, to explain in more detail why the porch is not compatible with the court. Explain the significance of the term “court as a whole.” Explain why that concept is important to the report’s findings and aid the reader in understanding the impact of parts beginning to disappear. Provide a plan of the site as it exists today, showing the driveway and the footprint of the buildings so that the reader understands how they relate to each other.

3. Commissioner Grumbine: Provide a more exhaustive report with photo dialogue and detailing. Review the historic nature of the spatial relationships of the court.
4. Commissioner Drury: Since this court was built as an eight-cottage court, taking two away will break the historical spatial relationship of the court and should be considered in the report. The structures on 1117 and 1121 Garden Street that are not considered significant due to alterations do contribute to the overall rhythm of the streetscape and should be taken into consideration.

5. Chair La Voie: Since there are so many structures being discussed in this report, it is very difficult to follow. It should be divided into chapters, one for each building being evaluated, with very specific photographs of conditions that have been altered. A discussion of the spatial relationships within the court and the urban environment that they create should be provided. Provide a discussion of the neighborhood and how these structures contribute to the character and scale of the neighborhood as it has existed historically.

Motion: **Continued indefinitely for a rewrite of the report.**
Action: Mahan/Drury, 6/0/1. (Suding abstained. Murray absent.) Motion carried.
HISTORIC STRUCTURES REPORT

3. 226-232 E ANAPAMU ST; 1121 & 1117 GARDEN ST; 223 E FIGUEROA ST H; 223 E FIGUEROA ST G

(2:20)

Assessor’s Parcel Number: 029-162-006, -007, -008, -009, -010, -012, -020
029-161-021

Application Number: MST2017-00092

Owner: Barranca Enterprises, Inc.

Architect: DesignARC

(Project site contains twin Queen Anne Free Classic style homes constructed in 1905 that are eligible to be designated as Structures of Merit. Proposal for a new mixed-use apartment/commercial structure using the Average Unit-Size Density Incentive Program. The project will comprise a voluntary lot merger of eight parcels (APNs 029-162-006, 029-162-007, 029-162-008, 029-162-009, 029-162-010, 029-162-012, 029-162-020, 029-162-021). Proposal includes demolishing all existing improvements, except the twin Queen Anne Free Classic style homes, which will be relocated to the Garden Street frontage to provide better context for the early 19th century buildings, and constructing a new four-story apartment/commercial building. The unit mix will be 24 one-bedroom apartments, 22 two-bedroom apartments, and 6 three-bedroom apartments, for a total of 52 residential units, and an average unit size of 809 square feet per unit. Also proposed are 87 parking spaces provided in a new 34,079 square foot, two-level basement parking garage, and 52 bike parking spaces. Project is within the Priority Housing Overlay (37-63 du/ac). A Historic Structures/Sites Report will be required to evaluate all structures on the site and to evaluate the impacts of the proposed project on the potential historic resources. Project also requires review by Planning Commission.)

(Review of the Historic Structures/Sites Report prepared by Alexandra Cole. The report found that cottages at 228 and 230 East Anapamu Street, and 223 A, 223 B, 223 D, and 223 F East Figueroa Street are considered eligible for designation as Structures of Merit. The buildings at 226 and 232 East Anapamu Street, 1117 and 1121 Garden Street, and 223 C, 223 E, 223 G, and 223 H East Figueroa Street are not considered significant historic resources.)

Actual time: 2:33 p.m.

Present: Alexandra Cole, Historian; and Greg Reitz, REthink Development, Applicant

Staff comments: Ms. Hernandez stated that she agreed with the conclusions of the report, with a couple of comments. The bungalow at 223 C E. Figueroa Street in the court was found not significant; however, it does retain the fenestration pattern that all four of the 1925 cottages have along the center of the court, with a single and double window pattern that gently guides the eye down the court and causes it to relate spatially in that way. If 223 C was removed, it would impact the other three remaining from 1925. The 1916 buildings do not have this pattern.

In addition, the setting of the buildings on Anapamu Street has been sacrificed as the Spanish Colonial Revival style has overshadowed the turn-of-the-century buildings’ integrity of setting, but the rhythm of Queen Anne Free Classic style twin buildings placed alongside each other draws the eye to their important features. The rhythm of identical bay windows and strong front gables and porches is enhanced because they are placed next to each other, and separating them would sacrifice their significance of association.
Public comment opened at 2:42 p.m.

1. Steve Harrel, neighbor, spoke in support of the conclusions of the report.
2. Steve Hoegerman, neighbor, expressed that all the cottages, the courtyard, and the neighborhood should be kept intact to maintain context.

Public comment closed at 2:46 p.m.

Commission comments:

1. Commissioner Grumbine: On page 15, address the repair of the column on the corner of the porch on 228 E. Anapamu to match 230 E. Anapamu. Revise all mentions of “Doric columns” to “Tuscan columns.” On page 16, under “Description,” second sentence, consider revision that the whole entablature encircles the house. On page 28, under “Description,” revise to “by a pair of Tuscan columns.” On page 47, feature 2, the criteria of a bungalow court being “visible from the sidewalk” excludes other internal block relationships that make a bungalow court significant. Clarify why the three cottages on Garden retain integrity of scale, setback, and massing, while the eight cottages, with their strong general organization, scale, and massing, do not.

2. Commissioner Suding: On page 1, correct 232 Anapamu to 223. On page 14, include a summary at the end as was provided in the analysis of other structures.

3. Commissioner La Voie: The spatial relationship is what is important about the bungalows; their urban pattern as a whole is a neighborhood characteristic, not just the parts visible from the street.

4. Commissioner Orias: On page 20, item I, further describe why the style does not rise to the level of containing singular physical characteristics. On page 50, further describe or show why the bungalows are not identical. On page 51, further describe or show why they do not have “integrity of design.” On page 70, item 6, clarify the statement about the bungalows “hidden from view” and describe how this is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior’s standards regarding spatial relationships. Also address the question of whether owner versus tenant-occupied homes contributes to an evaluation of significance.

5. Commissioner Mahan: In a Phase II report, clarify which parts of the Queen Anne Free Classic buildings will be relocated, and if the lower story is part of the original houses; also clarify what will happen to the Garden Street cottages, and how their removal will affect the streetscape. On page 21, address if the altered roof on 230 East Anapamu will be repaired. The Queen Anne Free Classic buildings should be kept together, in the best configuration possible. The motor court has integrity and is worth protecting, despite the alterations of some bungalows.

6. Commissioner Drury: In a Phase II report, address how, if they are relocated, the change in spatial relationship of the Queen Anne Free Classic buildings impacts their significance. He would like to see them maintain their relationship together as it exists on Anapamu, to relate to one another as originally intended. The bungalow court is a good example of workforce housing and a charming mini-community that should be left as is.

7. Commissioner Veyna: Expressed that compromising smaller developments and losing the history of the City little by little is concerning.
Motion: Continued indefinitely for the preparer of the report to address the Commission’s concerns about the substance of the report—i.e., the edits, additions, and corrections.

Action: Suding/Mahan. Motion failed.

Substitute Motion:
Continued indefinitely for the preparer of the report to consider the Commission’s comments and concerns and revise the report accordingly.

Action: Orias/Suding, 6/0/1. (La Voie abstained.) Motion carried.

Individual comments: Commissioner Mahan requested that any revisions to the report be colored to distinguish them from the rest of the text.

* THE COMMISSION RECESSED FROM 3:31 TO 3:42 P.M. *
HISTORIC STRUCTURES REPORT

11. 226 E ANAPAMU ST  R-O Zone

Assessor’s Parcel Number: 029-162-006
Application Number: MST2017-00092
Owner: Barranca Enterprises, Inc.
Architect: DesignARC, Inc.

(Project site contains twin Queen Anne Free Classic style homes constructed in 1905 that are eligible to be designated as Structures of Merit. Proposal for a new mixed-use apartment/commercial structure using the Average Unit-Size Density Incentive Program. The project will comprise a voluntary lot merger of eight parcels (APNs 029-162-006, 029-162-007, 029-162-008, 029-162-009, 029-162-010, 029-162-012, 029-162-020, 029-162-021). The proposal includes demolishing all existing improvements, except the twin Queen Anne Free Classic style homes, which will be relocated to the Garden Street frontage to provide better context for the early 19th century buildings, and constructing a new four-story mixed-use building. The unit mix will be 24 one-bedroom apartments, 22 two-bedroom apartments, and 6 three-bedroom apartments, for a total of 52 residential units, with an average unit size of 809 square feet per unit. Approximately 6,648 square feet of commercial space is proposed. The project includes 87 parking spaces provided in a new 34,079 square foot, two-level basement parking garage, and 52 bike parking spaces. The project site is designated Office/High Density within the Priority Housing Overlay (37-63 du/ac). A Historic Structures/Sites Report will be required to evaluate all structures on the site and to evaluate the impacts of the proposed project on the potential historic resources. Project also requires review by Planning Commission.)

(Review of Historic Structures/Sites Report prepared by Alexandra Cole. The report found that the houses at 228 and 230 East Anapamu Street and 223 A, 223 B, 223 D, and 223 F East Figueroa Street are considered eligible for listing as Structures of Merit, and the houses at 226 and 232 East Anapamu Street, 1117 and 1121 Garden Street, and 223 C, 223 G, and 223 H East Figueroa Street are not considered significant historic resources.)

Actual time: 2:57 p.m.

Present: Alexandra Cole, Historian; Greg Reitz, Developer; Mark Shields, Designer, DesignARC; and Allison DeBusk, Project Planner, City of Santa Barbara

Public comment opened at 3:13 p.m.

The following people expressed opposition or concerns:
1. Steve Hoegerman, neighbor, emphasized the unity of the cottages in the motor court and asked that it be preserved. Correspondence from Mr. Hoegerman was also acknowledged.
2. Josephine Di Loreto emphasized the unique character of each cottage in the motor court.
3. Sacha Kapernekas stated that she restored cottage C to match the “feel” of the other cottages, and that the motor court should be preserved.
4. Theron Kontos, neighbor, asked that the courtyard and its historical feel be kept intact, as it makes Santa Barbara unique.
5. Kellam de Forest stated that the report does not recognize that the whole area is a cultural landscape built up over years and is a significant feature of Santa Barbara. Gentrification of this area will alter Santa Barbara and the sense of place.

Public comment closed at 3:21 p.m.

EXHIBIT G
Staff comments: Ms. Hernandez stated that if the Commission votes to reject a Report and eventually denies a demolition permit, the Commission must move to designate the resource as a City Landmark. If this is the route the Commission chooses, she suggested the court as a whole be designated one Landmark, as it is significant as a whole rather than in its individual structures. If the HLC eventually approves a demolition permit, it can impose any mitigation measures it sees fit.

Or the Commission can move to designate the buildings as Structures of Merit, and later, in review of the Phase II Report, it could require any mitigation measures it sees fit for demolition. If the court is designated as a Structure of Merit as a whole, the demolition of part of the court could be considered a partial demolition. If the Commission finds that the structures in question do have historic or architectural significance, the Commission must specifically identify why it disagrees, indicate the significance criteria met, and move to initiate designation of the property.

Motion: Continued indefinitely with comments:
1. The Commission thanked the report author for a comprehensive report and thorough evaluation of the individual buildings, and for responding to feedback.
2. Discuss the cultural landscape, both of the Figueroa Street ensemble and the general neighborhood, and their relationship to each other.
3. Discuss, free of any label, the spatial relationships of the Figueroa Street ensemble and identify what is important and unique about this.
4. Discuss the historic feeling remaining in the neighborhood.
5. Identify precise distances to nearby historic or potentially historic resources.
6. Provide either a readable aerial photograph and/or a plot plan of the block to show the spatial relationships in plan form.
7. Discuss “the soul” of the neighborhood.

Action: Drury/Mahan, 8/0/0. Motion carried.

* THE COMMISSION RECESSED FROM 4:16 TO 4:24 P.M. *

MISCELLANEOUS ACTION ITEM

12. 228 E ANAPAMU ST

(3:25) Assessor’s Parcel Number: 029-162-007
Owner: Barranca Enterprises, Inc.

(Add the Queen Anne Free Classic house constructed in 1905 to the City’s Potential Historic Resources List as it was found eligible to be designated a Structure of Merit in the Historic Structures/Sites Report accepted by HLC on August 23, 2017. Once the project has been completed, the building will have a hearing for designation as a Structure of Merit.)

Item not heard due to the continuance of Item 11.
CONCEPT REVIEW - CONTINUED

4. 226 E ANAPAMU ST

(3:10) Assessor's Parcel Number: 029-162-006
Application Number: MST2017-00092
Owner: Barranca Enterprises, Inc.
Architect: DesignARC

(Project site contains twin Queen Anne Free Classic style homes constructed in 1905 that are eligible to be designated as Structures of Merit. Proposal for a new mixed-use apartment/commercial structure using the Average Unit-Size Density Incentive Program. The project includes a voluntary lot merger of eight parcels (APNs 029-162-006, 029-162-007, 029-162-008, 029-162-009, 029-162-010, 029-162-012, 029-162-020, 029-162-021). The proposal includes demolishing all existing improvements, except the twin Queen Anne Free Classic style homes, which will be relocated to the Garden Street frontage, and constructing a new four-story mixed-use building. The unit mix will be 24 one-bedroom apartments, 22 two-bedroom apartments, and 6 three-bedroom apartments, for a total of 52 residential units, with an average unit size of 802 square feet per unit. Approximately 6,084 square feet of commercial space is proposed. The project includes 72 parking spaces provided in a new 11,545 square foot basement parking garage, and 52 bike parking spaces. The project site is designated office/High Density within the Priority Housing Overlay (37-63 du/ac). A Historic Structures/Sites Report will be required to evaluate all structures on the site and to evaluate the impacts of the proposed project on the potential historic resources. Project also requires concept review by Planning Commission.)

(A. Review of a Cultural Landscape Study prepared by Post/Hazeltine Associates. The Cultural Landscape Study did not identify a substantially intact cultural landscape covering the entire study area; however, clusters of substantially intact resources were identified that have a direct association with the late 19th and early 20th century settlement of the Laguna neighborhood and contribute substantially to the neighborhood's streetscape. The Historic Structures/Sites Report prepared by Alexandra Cole concluded that cottages 228 and 230 East Anapamu Street, and 223A, 223B, 223D, and 223F East Figueroa Street are considered eligible for listing as Structures of Merit. Cottage 226 East Anapamu Street, building at 232 East Anapamu Street, and cottages 1117 and 1121 Garden Street and 223C, E, G, and H East Figueroa Street are not considered significant. The report was last reviewed on August 23, 2017. Staff will note EXHIBIT H)
on all the parcels of the properties found significant in the reports that are not on the subject parcel that they are eligible to be designated historic resources and will notify the owners.)

RECUSAL: To avoid any actual or perceived conflict of interest, Commissioner Orías recused herself from hearing this item.

Actual time: 3:37 p.m.

Present: Alexandra Cole, Pamela Post, and Tim Hazeltine, Historical Consultants

Staff comments: Ms. Hernandez clarified that both the Cultural Landscape Study and Historic Structures/Sites Report (HSSR) are being reviewed today. If properties are found significant in an HSSR accepted by the HLC, they must be added to the Potential Historic Resources List. If the HLC accepts the report, properties owned by the applicant can be added today. However, for other properties identified as significant, the City will need to send a 60-day notice to the owners. The next step would be a Phase 2 HSSR on the impacts of the project on all historic resources identified. Based on those conclusions, a California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) exemption or necessity for an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) will be determined.

Public comment opened at 3:49 p.m.

1. Kellam de Forest thanked the preparers of the Cultural Landscape Study for a very thorough report. To adhere to new state laws related to intensification of use, we are going to have to lose this intimate block. It is up to Commission to decide what to save.

2. Steve Hoegerman, owner of 223D & 223F E. Figueroa Street, stated that the historical low-rise livability of this block should be preserved, particularly the bungalow court. Do not save just clusters and individual historic houses, but the whole. We need more time to examine the report and get neighbors involved.

3. Nancy Weiss, neighbor, stated that the Cultural Landscape Study contains a lot of good information and speaks to a critical issue of how we want this neighborhood to look over the next 50 years. She requested that the HLC consider the report gradually and allow for more community engagement. She commented that based on the report, an EIR for the project seems warranted.

Public comment closed at 3:56 p.m.

Motion: Accept the Cultural Landscape Study and the Historic Structures Report as submitted.
Action: Grumbine/Mahan, 7/0/0. (Orías absent.) Motion carried.

* THE COMMISSION RECESSED FROM 4:23 TO 4:35 P.M. *

(B. Third Concept Review. Comments Only. Project requires review by Planning Commission. Project design was last reviewed on April 19, 2017.)

Actual time: 4:35 p.m.

Present: Greg Reitz, Developer, Rethink Development; and Mark Shields and Melisa Turner, DesignARC
Public comment opened at 4:56 p.m.

The following people expressed support:
1. Steve Harrel, neighbor

The following people expressed opposition or concerns:
1. Nancy Weiss, neighbor, stated that it would be better to preserve all the bungalows in the court. She asked that the HLC consider the impact on views and stated that the bulk and scale are still large; the Queen Anne buildings will be dwarfed and out of sync with the size and style of the new building. She also emphasized the importance of story poles.
2. Josephine DiLoreto reiterated Ms. Weiss' comments and opposes demolishing any of the bungalows.
3. Steve Hoegerman stated that this is a mostly residential area, and that the existence of buildings of similar bulk and scale in the area does mitigate adding another. He also spoke in favor of story poles.

Public comment closed at 5:03 p.m.

Straw vote: How many Commissioners support a more Craftsman expression of the terminus to the motor court as opposed to a Spanish Colonial Revival expression? 7/0 Passed

Motion: Continue indefinitely with comments:
1. The majority of the Commission does not support the size, bulk, and scale, and cannot make findings for neighborhood compatibility.
2. The building and architecture need to be simplified to be more residential in scale and expression.
3. The building footprint should be modulated to accommodate tall trees, with sustainable root structure, to mitigate the building mass.
4. The massing of the building at the corner needs to be modulated to be more residential in expression.
5. The Commission opposes the fourth story on the commercial corner and also opposes a reintroduction of a fourth floor of residential development in the proposal.
6. The majority of the Commission would like to see story poles eventually, unless the building is drastically reduced.
7. The Commission would like to see the pedestrian perspective from the sidewalk across the street (i.e., five-foot eye-level perspective of the building along Garden and Anapamu Streets).
8. Give consideration to reducing the width of the loading archway.
9. The Commission supports a more Craftsman expression of the terminus of the motor court as opposed to a Spanish Colonial Revival expression.
10. The garage entrance off Garden Street is supportable.
11. The 3-D model and neighborhood graphics provided were helpful in understanding the project.
12. Return with a further 3-D massing model.

Action: Mahan/Drury, 7/0/0. (Orias absent.) Motion carried.
MISCELLANEOUS ACTION ITEM

5. 228 E ANAPAMU ST
(4:40) Assessor’s Parcel Number: 029-162-007
Owner: Figamu, LLC
(Add the Queen Anne Free Classic house constructed in 1905 to the City’s Potential Historic Resources List as it was found to be eligible to be designated a Structure of Merit in the Historic Structures/Sites Report accepted by the HLC on April 4, 2018. Once the project has been completed, the building will have a hearing for designation as a Structure of Merit.)

Actual time: 6:07 p.m.

Present: Nicole Hernandez, Urban Historian, City of Santa Barbara

Public comment opened at 6:07 p.m., and as no one wished to speak, it closed.

Motion: Add the structure located at 228 East Anapamu Street to the City’s Potential Historic Resources List.
Action: Mahan/Lenvik, 7/0/0. (Grumbine absent.) Motion carried.

MISCELLANEOUS ACTION ITEM

6. 230 E ANAPAMU ST
(4:45) Assessor’s Parcel Number: 029-162-008
Owner: Figamu, LLC
(Add the Queen Anne Free Classic house constructed in 1905 to the City’s Potential Historic Resources List as it was found to be eligible to be designated a Structure of Merit in the Historic Structures/Sites Report accepted by the HLC on April 4, 2018. Once the project has been completed, the building will have a hearing for designation as a Structure of Merit.)

Actual time: 6:08 p.m.

Present: Nicole Hernandez, Urban Historian, City of Santa Barbara

Public comment opened at 6:08 p.m., and as no one wished to speak, it closed.

Motion: Add the structure located at 230 East Anapamu Street to the City’s Potential Historic Resources List.
Action: Mahan/Veyna, 7/0/0. (Grumbine absent.) Motion carried.
Motion: Postpone the following addresses:
1. 111 East Arrellaga Street to June 13, 2018; 1723 Grand Avenue due to owner unable to appear.
Action: Drury/Veyna, 7/0/1. (Drury abstained from Items on Grand Avenue.) Motion carried.

Staff comment: It was later noted during ratification of these minutes that 326 Arrellaga St., from Exhibit A, Potential Historic Resources List, will be re-noticed and added to the next collective designated Potential Historic Resources List.

Motion: Adopt Resolutions to designate as Structures of Merit the multiple historic resources per attached Exhibit A. except for those removed or postponed.
Action: Grumbine/Mahan, 6/1/1. (Drury abstained from Items on Grand Avenue. Lenvik opposed.) Motion carried.

Individual comments: Lenvik stated that because the Commission is nominating numerous residences that he believes do not warrant Structure of Merit status, he must vote against the entire list which is being offered in one motion.

* THE COMMISSION RECESSED FROM 3:15 TO 3:25 P.M. *

CONCEPT REVIEW - CONTINUED

2. 226 E ANAPAMU ST
   O-R Zone
   
   (2:35) Assessor’s Parcel Number: 029-162-006
   Application Number: MST2017-00092
   Owner: Barranca Enterprises, Inc.
   Architect: DesignARC

   (Project site contains twin Queen Anne Free Classic style homes constructed in 1905 that are eligible to be designated as Structures of Merit. Proposal for a new mixed-use apartment/commercial structure using the Average Unit-Size Density Incentive Program. The project includes a voluntary lot merger of eight parcels (APNs 029-162-006, 029-162-007, 029-162-008, 029-162-009, 029-162-010, 029-162-012, 029-162-020, 029-162-021). The proposal includes demolishing all existing improvements, except the twin Queen Anne Free Classic style homes, which will be relocated to the Garden Street frontage, and constructing a new four-story mixed-use building. The unit mix will be 24 one-bedroom apartments, 22 two-bedroom apartments, and 6 three-bedroom apartments, for a total of 52 residential units, with an average unit size of 802 square feet per unit. Approximately 6,084 square feet of commercial space is proposed. The project includes 72 parking spaces provided in a new 11,545 square foot basement parking garage, and 52 bike parking spaces. The project site is designated office/High Density within the Priority Housing Overlay (37-63 du/ac). A Historic Structures/Sites Report will be required to evaluate all structures on the site and to evaluate the impacts of the proposed project on the potential historic resources. Project also requires concept review by Planning Commission.)

   (Fourth Concept Review. Comments Only. Project requires review by Planning Commission. Project design was last reviewed on April 4, 2018.)

Actual time: 3:25 p.m.

EXHIBIT I
Present: Mark Sheild and Jason Greer, DesignARC; and Greg Wrights, Project Applicant

Public comment opened at 3:46 p.m.,

The following people expressed opposition or concerns:
1. Kellem De Forest stated that the project is still too big and needs the height figures to be specified. Mr. De Forest also inquired if the Queen Ann Structures will lose their structure of merit designation if they are moved.
2. Alison Galindo is enthusiastic about the new development and supports the Queen Ann Buildings being moved; however, the project is still too large for the neighborhood, a two-story project would be more appropriate, the project is too dense, and creates parking concerns. Ms. Galindo also requested that landscaping be implemented to encourage privacy and discourage trespassing.
3. Paul Kontos is concerned with the integrity of the motor court being maintained and the height of the project.
4. Sasha Kapernekas stated that the project damages the integrity of the courtyard and the style is incompatible with the neighborhood.
5. Theron Kontos requested that the two rear bungalows be restored instead of demolished so as to maintain the integrity of the courtyard and stated that the project is too high and will impact traffic negatively.
6. Josephine Diloreto asked about the underground parking and wanted to know where the entrance and exits would be located. Ms. Diloreto also stated that she would like the applicant to consider ways to maintain the courtyard.
7. Steve Hogerman stated that the size, bulk, and scale of the project is incompatible with the neighborhood, believes the two houses up for demolition add to the character of the neighborhood so their removal will negatively impact the streetscape, suggests that the applicant consider building behind the existing cottages or applying for a lot split to keep the cottages intact and separate, and also expressed that signage is insufficient to inform the public of the project.
8. Correspondence in opposition or with concerns from Emily Bell and Mark Ehlen was acknowledged.

Public comment closed at 4:05 p.m.

Straw vote: How many Commissioners can support the 3 styles of architecture proposed? 4/3 Passed

Motion: Continue indefinitely with comments:
1. Printed elevations along with the 3D model should be provided.
2. The size, bulk, and scale of the project is incompatible with the neighborhood.
3. The Commission appreciates the reduction of the building height, the reduction in the number of units, and division of the units.
4. The setbacks currently proposed along Garden Street and East Anapamu Street are inadequate.
5. The Two-story element that was removed should be restored at the corner of Garden Street and Anapamu Street.
6. The scale is incompatible with the incremental increase and scale as identified in the cultural landscape plan.
7. The encroachment of balconies over the private yard and the encroachment of the building into the open space is a concern and should be restudied.

8. A slim majority of the Commission is in support of breaking the building up into the three styles of architecture as proposed, however more information is required.

9. The folding plate roof is not an appropriate roof form on the craftsman style and should be restudied.

10. The building should be more residential in scale and simplified.

Action: Drury/Grumbine, 7/0/1. (Orías abstained.) Motion carried.

* THE COMMISSION RECESSED FROM 4:40 TO 4:50 P.M. *
CONCEPT REVIEW - CONTINUED

8. 226 E ANAPAMU ST

(3:25) Assessor’s Parcel Number: 029-162-006
Application Number: MST2017-00092
Owner: Barranca Enterprises, Inc.
Architect: DesignArc

(Project site contains twin Queen Anne Free Classic style homes constructed in 1905 that are eligible to be designated as Structures of Merit. Proposal for a new mixed-use apartment/commercial structure using the Average Unit-Size Density Incentive Program. The project includes a voluntary lot merger of eight parcels (APNs 029-162-006, 029-162-007, 029-162-008,-029-162-009, 029-162-010, 029-162-012, 029-162-020, 029-162-021). The proposal includes demolishing all existing improvements, except the twin Queen Anne Free Classic style homes, which will be relocated to the Garden Street frontage, and constructing a new four-story mixed-use building. The unit mix will be 24 one-bedroom apartments, 22 two-bedroom apartments, and 6 three-bedroom apartments, for a total of 52 residential units, with an average unit size of 802 square feet per unit. Approximately 6,084 square feet of commercial space is proposed. The project includes 72 parking spaces provided in a new 11,545 square foot basement parking garage, and 52 bike parking spaces. The project site is designated office/High Density within the Priority Housing Overlay (37-63 du/ac). A Historic Structures/Sites Report will be required to evaluate all structures on the site and to evaluate the impacts of the proposed project on the potential historic resources. Project also requires concept review by Planning Commission.)

(Fifth Concept Review. Comments Only. Project requires review by Planning Commission. Project design was last reviewed on May 16, 2018.)

RECUSAL: To avoid any actual or perceived conflict of interest, Commissioner Orias recused herself from hearing this item.

Actual time: 3:54 p.m.
Present: Greg Wrights, Project Applicant; Melissa Turner, Senior Project Manager, DesignArc; Mark Shields, Project Designer; and Philip Suding, Landscape Architecture

Staff comments: Ms. Hernandez stated that the ordinance 22.22.104 reads that any new construction in El Pueblo Viejo must be compatible with Spanish Colonial Revival or Mediterranean in style, the building proposed at the end of the bungalow court is in the Craftsman style and only the Planning Commission can grant a variance to the ordinance, staff or HLC cannot grant a variance. The Craftsman and Spanish Colonial Revival style buildings were often constructed side by side in Santa Barbara in the 1930s as seen throughout the Bungalow Haven neighborhood.

Ms. Plummer stated that as per the City of Santa Barbara On-Site Noticing Requirements that AUD projects require signage in front of the development with a picture of the development. Signage must be posted 10 days prior to the next hearing with the Historic Landmarks Commission review.

Public comment opened at 4:32 p.m.

The following people expressed opposition or concerns:
1. Steve Hoegerman spoke in opposition to the size, bulk, and scale of the project. Mr. Hoegerman suggested a lot split and requested additional signage to inform the neighborhood of the project.
2. Josephine Deloreto expressed her opinion that the building is out of place and would like the motor court to be preserved.
3. Alison Galindo expressed excitement about the new Queen Annes but suggests a two story building rather than three. Ms. Galindo shared concerns about parking, privacy, traffic, security, and litter.
4. Sasna Kapernekas spoke in opposition to the size due to the motor court and traffic, the deterioration of privacy, and parking issues.
5. Christine Neuhauser spoke in opposition to the scale and height of the building due to incompatibility with the rest of the neighborhood. Correspondence from Ms. Neuhauser was also acknowledged.
6. Correspondence in opposition or with concerns from Paul Kontos and Mark Ehlen was read into the record.

Public comment closed at 4:46 p.m.

Straw vote: How many Commissioners find that the size, bulk, and scale are acceptable? 2/5 Failed
Straw vote: How many Commissioners find that the architecture is generally acceptable? 4/3 Passed
Straw vote: How many Commissioners find that the setbacks from Anapamu Street and Garden Street are acceptable? 4/3 Passed
Straw vote: How many Commissioners find that the interior allocation of open space is adequate? 2/5 Failed
Straw vote: How many Commissioners find that the amount of landscaping is adequate? 0/7 Failed
Straw vote: How many Commissioners find that the width of the paseos is adequate for the scale of building? 3/4 Failed
Straw vote: How many Commissioners can support the use of the craftsman style adjacent to the bungalow court and a variation from the ordinance? 6/1 Passed

Straw vote: How many Commissioners find that the in earth open space adequate? 2/5 Failed

**Motion:** Continue to the Planning Commission with comments:

1. The Commission finds that the Compatibility Analysis Criteria generally have been met (per SBMC 22.22.145.B.) as follows:
   a. The Commission finds that the size, bulk, and scale is incompatible with the neighborhood.
   b. The architecture is generally acceptable.
   c. The amount of open space provided is inadequate for the size and scale of the building and the neighborhood.
   d. The public views are not affected.
   e. It is compatible with AUD guidelines.
2. The Commission has heard considerable concern from the neighborhood about the adequacy of parking, and residential character and density.
3. The majority of the Commission supports the use of craftsman style architecture immediately adjacent to the bungalows as being an appropriate response to a historic resource.

**Action:** Drury/Grumbine, 7/0/0. (Orias absent.) Motion carried.
SBMC Chapter 22.22 - HISTORIC STRUCTURES

22.22.104 Required Architectural Styles.

A. ALTERATIONS TO STRUCTURES WITHIN EL PUEBLO VIEJO.

1. Generally. Any structure hereafter constructed or altered as to its exterior appearance and located within El Pueblo Viejo Landmark District shall, as to its exterior architecture, be compatible with the Hispanic tradition as it has developed in the City of Santa Barbara from the later 18th century to the present, with emphasis on the early 19th century "California Adobe" and "Monterey Revival" styles, and the "Spanish Colonial Revival" style of the period from 1915 to 1930. Examples of these styles are:
   a. Hill-Carrillo Adobe ("California Adobe").
   b. De la Guerra Adobe ("California Adobe").
   c. Covarrubias Adobe ("California Adobe").
   d. Mihran Studios ("Monterey Revival").
   e. Arlington Theatre ("Spanish Colonial Revival").
   f. Santa Barbara County Courthouse ("Spanish Colonial Revival").
   g. El Paseo ("Spanish Colonial Revival").
   h. Lobero Theatre ("Spanish Colonial Revival").

2. Alterations Within El Pueblo Viejo. Notwithstanding subsection (A)(1) hereof, alterations to existing structures within the El Pueblo Viejo Landmark District may also be permitted by the Commission under the following circumstances:
   a. The Commission determines that the owner of the existing structure is proposing alterations or additions to the structure that match the original architectural style and such alterations or additions do not significantly alter the structure; and
   b. The Commission determines that the alteration or addition would be more compatible with the existing structure by matching and maintaining the existing architectural style which demonstrates outstanding attention to architectural design, detail, material, or craftsmanship.

B. LANDMARKS AND STRUCTURES OF MERIT. A designated Landmark or Structure of Merit not conforming to any of the architectural styles required in Sections 22.22.100(A.) and 22.22.104(A.) of this Chapter may be altered on the exterior for the purpose of restoration of its original appearance, or to substantially aid its preservation or enhancement, in its particular architectural style, with the prior written approval of the Commission or City Council under Section 22.22.170.

C. OUTDOOR LIGHTING. Any structure hereafter constructed or altered as to its exterior appearance and located within El Pueblo Viejo Landmark District shall comply with the applicable requirements of Chapter 22.75 as to its outdoor lighting, and with the City's Outdoor Lighting Design Guidelines. (Ord. 5333, 2004; Ord. 5035, 1997; Ord. 4848, 1994; Ord. 4729, 1991; Ord. 4175, 1982; Ord. 3900 §1, 1977.)
July 11, 2017

Melisa Cinarli Turner
DesignARC, Inc.
29 W. Calle Laureles
Santa Barbara, CA 93105

SUBJECT: 226-232 E. ANAPAMU ST., 1121 & 1117 GARDEN ST. & 223 E. FIGUEROA ST. G & H; MST2017-00092; APN: 029-162-006; -007; -008; -009; -010; -012; -020, and 029-161-021

PRT MEETING DATE: Tuesday, July 18, 2017 From 1:15 P.M. - 2:15 P.M.
630 Garden Street, 2nd Floor Conference Room

Dear Ms. Cinarli Turner:

I. INTRODUCTION/PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The purpose of this review is to assist you with the City’s review process including Development Application Review Team (DART) application requirements, and to identify significant issues relevant to the project. This review does not include a detailed analysis of building code compliance. The building code compliance review would be completed at time of building permit submittal should an application proceed.

This letter will outline our preliminary comments on your proposal. Please review this letter carefully prior to our scheduled meeting date; we will answer your questions at that time. The specificity of our comments varies depending on the amount of information available at this time. In many cases, more issues arise at later steps in the process. However, our intent is to provide applicants with as much feedback and direction as possible at this pre-application step in the process. We also encourage you to review the Major Santa Barbara - 2015 Major Issues Project Compliance Checklist. This checklist identifies major issues that applicants may encounter while pursuing development application approvals.

Staff from various City Departments/Divisions have reviewed your conceptual plans and correspondence for the subject project, as well as a Preliminary Title Report dated January 11, 2017.

The project consists of the demolition of existing development on the lots, with the exception of two Queen Anne cottages that are proposed to be relocated to 1117 and 1121 Garden Street. New development includes construction of a three- and four-story mixed-use development containing 52 residential apartments (average unit size of 794 square feet) and 6,648 square feet of commercial floor area. Parking for 81 vehicles would be provided in an underground parking structure; parking for 52 bicycles would be provided at-grade in a bike room. Proposed density would be 63 dwelling units per acre, the maximum allowed under the Priority Housing Overlay...
designations. Maximum height would be 45 feet. Approximately 16,000 cubic yards of grading is anticipated. A voluntary lot merger of the eight involved parcels is proposed.

This project requires Planning Commission review for an Average Unit Size Density, Priority Housing Overlay project on a project site exceeding 15,000 square feet.

II. COMMENTS AND ISSUES

A. Planning Division

1. **Staff supportability.** Staff has concerns about the project’s compatibility with surrounding development and potential impacts to existing historic resources. Complete comments cannot be provided at this time because the analysis of the significance of the existing structures has not been completed. See additional comments below. However, the project concept of mixed-use is supportable.

2. **Planning Commission Concept Review.** Planning Commission concept review of the proposed project is required (SBMC §28.20.080.A). This review shall take place after concept review by the Historic Landmarks Commission (HLC).

   Based on the current requirement for Planning Commission approval of a Development Plan (refer to additional discussion under the subheading “Nonresidential Growth Management Program (GMP)” below), this concept review would occur concurrently with review of the Development Plan (SBMC §28.20.080.C).

   However, if you reduce the amount of nonresidential floor area proposed to be less than 3,000 square feet, then the Historic Landmarks Commission (HLC) would be responsible for reviewing and approving the Development Plan, and a separate Planning Commission concept review would be required. Due to noticing requirements, hearing dates are generally scheduled at least 30 days in advance, so please keep that in mind with regard to timelines.

3. **Story Poles.** Story poles will be required for this project, prior to Planning Commission review. Story pole certification will be required. Information on requirements is available on our website, in the Visual Aid Submittal Packet handout.

4. **Historic Landmarks Committee (HLC):** On March 22, 2017 and April 19, 2017, the project’s design concept was reviewed by the HLC. Generally, the HLC had concerns with neighborhood compatibility, and mass, bulk and scale of the project. HLC also wanted the applicant team to retain the two cottages, at least in footprint and scale, at the end of the motor court.

5. **Historic Structures.** A Phase 1 Historic Structures/Sites Report (HSSR) was reviewed and continued with comments by the HLC on May 17, 2017, and again on June 28, 2017. Determining which existing structures are historically significant is a critical first step in staff’s review of the proposed development. As there is not yet consensus on which structures are significant, nor has there been an analysis of the project’s potential impact on said historic structures, staff cannot adequately analyze the proposed development. In addition, preliminarily, staff finds that preservation of the two identical Queen Anne Free Classic structures
would be more successful if those units were maintained adjacent to one another, as their integrity of association would be maintained as they create a rhythm on the streetscape of the bay window, front gable, and front porch together. As currently proposed, they would be located on either side of an existing one-story structure. This not only breaks up the two units (which were originally part of a triplet grouping), but the intervening structure could potentially be demolished, thereby disrupting the single-story streetscape that the proposed relocation is intended to achieve.

6. **General Plan Consistency.** The project would be consistent with City land use and housing policies to encourage the construction of rental housing in select commercial zones (Policies LG4, LG5, LG6 and H.10), but may be potentially inconsistent with Historic Resource Element policies to protect historic resources (Policies HR1, HR2 and HR3). See Attachment 1 for a complete list of applicable General Plan policies.

7. **Tenant Displacement Assistance Ordinance (TDAO).** The TDAO assists those tenants who are displaced due to their unit being demolished, eliminated, or lost as a result of a land use change. The TDAO applies to all discretionary or ministerial permits and requires notice to the tenants 60 days prior to filing an application. For purposes of the TDAO, an application includes any application to ABR, HLC, Staff Hearing Officer, or Planning Commission (DART application), or the Building and Safety Division for a building permit or demolition permit. Among the provisions is monetary displacement assistance in the amount of four times the median advertised rental rate or $5,000, whichever is greater. Special needs households, as defined in the ordinance, are entitled to greater assistance.

Initial compliance with the TDAO was confirmed prior to HLC review. For a complete copy of the TDAO, please refer to Chapter 28.89 of the Municipal Code, or find the TDAO handout on the City’s website at www.santabarbaraca.gov/services/planning/forms/planning.asp.

8. **Tree Removal.** SBMC Chapter 15.24 (Preservation of Trees) regulates tree removal and the degree of pruning allowed for privately owned trees. The removal of trees in a required front setback requires approval from the Community Development Department, and potentially the applicable design review board, prior to application completeness.

9. **Storm Water Management Program (SWMP).** This is a Tier 3 SWMP project, which must incorporate design solutions to meet the City’s storm water requirements for (1) water quality treatment; (2) peak runoff discharge rate; and (3) volume reduction for the entire project site. Please submit a hydrology/storm water report that demonstrates how these three requirements will be met on-site. Refer to the City’s Storm Water BMP Guidance Manual for more information: www.santabarbaraca.gov/depts/parksrec/creeks/quality/storm/default.asp.

Tier 3 projects must indicate where storm water from all hardscape will flow (i.e. clearly show how all hardscape will be treated by proposed BMPs). Include the
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direction of flow on all surfaces, including roofs, and include location of roof downspouts.

To comply with Tier 3 storm water requirements, if appropriate, you might consider implementing natural filtration devices, such as swale-like landscaping, rain gardens, other bioretention designs or permeable paving that allows infiltration of storm water into the soil for water quality treatment. These types of passive/natural capture and filtration design options are recommended as opposed to mechanical or proprietary device options, which pose maintenance problems, may not treat for all of the pollutants of concern, and often do not treat runoff as efficiently. Please refer to the City’s Storm Water BMP Guidance Manual.

On the Civil plan sheets identify all proposed work in the public right-of-way (ROW). If more than 500 square feet of new/replaced impervious area is proposed in the public ROW, a separate Tier 3 requirement is triggered. Also discuss the scope of work in the public ROW and storm water treatment in the Public ROW in the storm water report.

Before the Building Inspector will grant Certificate of Occupancy and finalize the building permit, the project Civil Engineer that designed the post-construction BMPs must submit a stamped letter verifying that all post-construction BMPs were installed as approved and that they comply with the City’s Tier 3 storm water requirements. Alternatively, you may choose to have the Building and Safety Division certify compliance on behalf of the City for an additional fee.

Please be aware that for Tier 3 projects, storm water requirements must be satisfied before Design Review final approval.

10. **Average Unit-Size Density (AUD) Incentive Program.** The AUD Program, effective August 30, 2013, replaces the previously existing Variable Density Program and allows increased residential densities in order to encourage smaller, more affordable units in certain areas of the City. The AUD Program is available in the following zones of the City: R-3, R-4, HRC-2, R-O, C-P, C-1, C-2, C-M, and OC Zones, as shown on the City of Santa Barbara AUD Incentive Program Map (available on the City’s website).

The AUD Incentive Program (SBMC Chapter 28.20) will be in effect for a period of either eight years or until 250 residential units have been constructed under the Program, whichever occurs first.

Compliance with AUD requirements:

a. **Density.** The project density is consistent with the density provisions and average unit size allowed under the AUD Priority Housing Overlay designation. In order to qualify for these incentives, a written covenant agreeing to maintain the residential units as rental housing is required prior to issuance of any building permits.

b. **Height.** Building height appears to be consistent with allowed maximums in that it is no more than 45 feet tall and four stories (SBMC
§28.20.070.C). However, additional information is required in order to confirm compliance.

c. **Setbacks.** The project complies with required setbacks in that it proposes a minimum setback of five feet along E. Anapamu and Garden Streets, and interior setbacks are not required because the project is adjacent to nonresidential zones along all interior property lines (SBMC §28.20.070.D.1).

d. **Distance Between Buildings.** Where applicable, the proposed distance between buildings is greater than ten feet (SBMC §28.20.070.E).

e. **Parking.** Proposed residential parking complies with the requirement of one vehicle space and one bicycle space per unit (SBMC §28.20.070.F). Additionally, 27 parking spaces and 4 bike parking spaces are required for the commercial portion of the project. These vehicle spaces have been provided; however, the commercial bike parking must be identified.

f. **Outdoor Living Space.** The project complies with the minimum required outdoor living space (common outdoor living space) in that it is more than 15% of the net lot area and a 20-foot by 20-foot area is provided (SBMC §28.20.070.G).

11. **Nonresidential Growth Management Program (GMP).** Effective April 11, 2013, until December 31, 2033, the amount of new nonresidential floor area available for nonresidential construction projects shall be restricted to no more than one-million three-hundred fifty thousand (1,350,000) square feet. SBMC Chapter 28.85 implements the GMP and provides details on the allocation of nonresidential square footage each year, categories of nonresidential square footage and development areas. Depending on where the project is located and at what time of year the application is submitted, the project may not be eligible for a nonresidential square footage allocation. If you decide to increase the square footage of your project during the DART process, contact your planner prior to submitting your revisions.

The project is located in the Downtown Development Area per the City’s Traffic Management Strategy.

The project site is proposing to demolish approximately 3,085 square feet of nonresidential floor area (based on recognized uses, refer to Attachment 2). Proposed development includes a total of 6,648 square feet of nonresidential floor area. This would result in approximately 3,563 square feet of net new nonresidential floor area. Therefore, approval of a Development Plan would be required. Development Plans for more than 3,000 square feet require a Development Application Review Team (DART) submittal for review by the City’s Land Development Team, and approval by the Planning Commission.

The subject lots have a potential maximum of 24,000 square feet of Minor and Small Addition floor area allocation available (refer to Attachment 2). However, these remaining Minor and Small Addition allocations can be assigned to the merged lot only if you can demonstrate on a site plan that the lot from which the
allocation is assigned could have developed the remaining square footage in compliance with current zoning standards (assuming surface parking). This calculation/demonstration will be important if you intend to transfer existing development rights pursuant to SBMC 28.95.020 in the future. Based on the small size of most of the parcels, it is unlikely that the available Minor and Small Addition floor area could be achieved. Calculations and appropriate documentation must be received prior to recordation of the lot merger if you intend to assign any of the Minor or Small Addition floor area.

12. **Commercial Use.** Please be aware that allowed uses within the commercial portion of the project would be limited to office uses with no retail trade (e.g. office uses such as accountant, architect, attorney, doctor, engineer, real estate broker), as identified in SBMC §28.48.030 R-0 Zone Uses Permitted.

13. **Alternative Energy.** The City of Santa Barbara supports use of alternative energy sources to conserve energy resources and reduce carbon emissions that contribute to climate change.
   
   a. **Solar Energy.** Installation of solar photo-voltaic arrays as part of new construction, redevelopment, and significant remodel projects should be provided in accordance with General Plan Policy ER6 and the City of Santa Barbara Solar Energy System Design Guidelines.
      
      - Multi-family residential projects of three or more units require provision of a minimum 2kw system per unit if physically feasible.
      - Commercial and industrial project require provision of a minimum of 5 watts of photovoltaic panel systems for every net new square foot of building floor area; or a photovoltaic system sized to meet a minimum of 30% of the average projected energy demand for the structure, whichever is lower.
   
   b. **Electric Vehicle Charging.** Project applicants are required to pre-wire developments to facilitate electric vehicle charging. This may be accomplished in a variety of ways depending on the scope of the project. Please discuss options with Planning and Transportation Planning staff and refer to the Central Coast Plug-In Electric Vehicle Readiness Plan and the City Climate Action Plan Policy 20, and the 2016 CGC & CBC.

14. **Stage Three Drought.** The City’s Water Shortage Contingency Plan states that the City Council should consider regulations of water use and suspension of permit approvals during Stage Two and Stage Three Drought Conditions. The City is currently in a Stage Three Drought Emergency condition, with some water use regulations and development restrictions in effect that restrict how water can be used during the drought. For more information, visit www.SantaBarbaraCA.gov/Drought.

Additionally, a staff team has been considering possible development restrictions in order to appropriately manage this critical water shortage while balancing possible effects on the local economy. These restrictions, as well as additional water use regulations, could be implemented by City Council as part of a phased
approach. Potential development restrictions could include, but are not limited to, mandatory landscape deferral, suspension of building permits for new pools, and suspension of building permits for projects that result in net new water use (generally, an increase in number of units or commercial floor area). These actions could be implemented as part of future phases of the Stage Three Drought Emergency. Staff anticipates that the City Council may consider implementation of additional regulations, depending on future drought conditions.

15. **Commercial Bicycle Parking.** Bicycle parking is required for the commercial development, at a rate of one space per seven vehicle parking spaces.

16. **Groundwater.** Please be aware that the project site is identified as having moderately shallow groundwater, especially given the fact that two levels of subterranean parking is proposed. Refer to Engineering comment #10 below.

17. **General Comments.** Given the amount of development proposed on the site, it will be important to consider how utilities will be accommodated. The aesthetic impact of these appurtenances will be a consideration by the HLC and may affect the site layout. For example, is an electrical transformer required? If so, where will it be located? Where will the backflow preventer be located? Where will the water meters be located?

18. **Annual Resident Survey.** For informational purposes only, all Average Unit-size Density Incentive Program projects in the High Density and Priority Housing Overlay zones shall conduct an annual resident survey and report the following information for each unit to the Planning Division by December 31st of each year for the first eight years of the project, commencing the year the project receives occupancy clearance. The annual report for each unit shall include:
   a. Net floor area.
   b. Number of bedrooms.
   c. Monthly rent or purchase price.
   d. Amount of Home Owners Association dues (if applicable).
   e. Date of purchase (if applicable).
   f. Periods of vacancy.
   g. Household size.
   h. Employment location of each resident by zip code.
   i. Number of automobiles owned by each household.

19. **Upcoming NZO Update.** The City is updating its Zoning Ordinance (Title 28 of the City’s Municipal Code) that establishes the zone classifications, permitted uses in the various zones, development standards and regulations, and the development review process. The New Zoning Ordinance (NZO) proposes changes to zoning regulations that affect land use, setbacks, parking, open yard, and other aspects of property development and use. It is expected that work on the NZO will culminate with adoption by the City Council this week with a
recommended effective date of October of this year. The Planning Commission has recommended to the City Council that, upon NZO adoption, any structure for which a Project Design Approval or other discretionary land use approval has been granted, or Building Permit has been issued, may be completed and used in accordance with the current Zoning Ordinance; all other projects will be subject to the regulations in the New Zoning Ordinance. City Council will make the final decision on what projects are affected by the new Zoning regulations. In the Coastal Zone, existing regulations will continue to apply until the New Zoning Ordinance is certified by the California Coastal Commission. You are encouraged to check the City’s NZO website (SantaBarbaraCA.gov/NZO) to see how the NZO will affect your pending project and for information about upcoming meetings and progress toward City Council adoption.

B. Engineering Division

1. This project is subject to Chapter 22.44 of the Santa Barbara Municipal Code and will require public improvements accordingly.

2. Damaged sections of curb, gutter, and sidewalk will need to be repaired. It appears that most of the curb, gutter, and sidewalk may require repairs.

3. The pedestrian ramp at the south corner of Garden and Anapamu Streets will need to conform to current ADA standards. Additionally, an easement may be required to provide for a pedestrian landing on topside of the ramp.

4. Restoration of sandstone hitching posts / structures in the right-of-way may be required.

5. Any damaged sandstone curb and gutter will need to be replaced by faux sandstone (concrete) curb and gutter.

6. Cut and cap at the main any sewer and water laterals that are to be abandoned. This process may involve trenching. Any trench will need to be crack and slurry sealed 20’ beyond the trench.

7. Slurry seal damaged sections of street. Please see comment #6 above.

8. The existing driveway aprons on Garden Street (immediately in front of the project parcels) will need to be brought up to current standards if they are to remain. Please keep in mind that current City standards require driveway aprons to be monolithically poured, which will require replacement of the entire apron.

9. Please discuss the boundary condition of any proposed merger with your surveyor. The City may require a Record of Survey that will need to be recorded prior to recordation of a merger. The Record of Survey, if required is reviewed and approved by the County Surveyor’s office. The City will consider the opinion(s) of your surveyor concerning the need and requirements for a Record of Survey. Please work with Public Works staff as desired to further discuss submittal of surveyor’s opinion ahead of a merger application.

10. The concept shows a subterranean parking garage. Please ensure that no groundwater is collected to be discharged by conduit or other method to the City
wastewater collection system or the City storm drain system (including the street), or to be percolated to the ground in the public right of way. This includes overflows of any system that may be provided on-site. Collection and discharge of any groundwater shall be provided on-site. It is recommended that wall design should be for the un-drained condition considering full depth hydrostatic pressure in addition to other forces.

C. Water Resources Division

1. Every new dwelling unit must be served by a separate City water meter. A water meter measuring the water supplied to the interior of a dwelling unit shall only measure the water used within that dwelling unit. Note that this necessitates individual water heating elements for each dwelling unit.

2. Due to the limited space in the right of way, the dwelling units may be served by way of City issued sub-meters located in a centralized location on the private property, fed by a private water main and a City master meter. Said master meter shall be located in the public right of way, protected by a backflow prevention assembly and may only serve the residential water sub-meters.

3. Flow calculations will be required to determine private main size and Water Distribution staff will determine the point of connection to the City water system.

4. All other uses including, but not limited to, irrigation, water features (pools, spas, fountains), shared laundry facilities, other common areas, and commercial uses shall be served by meters separate from the meters measuring the water supplied to the dwelling units, and shall be located in the public right of way. Water meters serving cottages should also be located in public right of way.

5. A dedicated City irrigation meter located in the public right of way is required if the irrigated landscaped area is equal to or greater than 1,000 square feet.

6. The owner shall grant to City an easement, license, or right of way as approved by the Public Works Director for purposes including but not limited to meter reading, maintenance and replacement, turning on or off of water service, installation or removal of flow restrictors, and ingress to and egress from all water sub-meters serving the residential units located on private property.

7. Flow calculations will be required to determine private main size and Water Distribution staff will determine the point of connection to the City water system.

8. Please identify issues in public right of way that would impede water service locations.

9. Identify which existing meters will be abandoned and which will remain. Abandoned services shall be capped off at the source.

10. Backflow prevention assemblies are required for the private main, private fire line, irrigation system/service and may be required for commercial water services.

11. The existing sewer system to serve the proposed project may require upgrades based on capacity. Developer shall provide fixture calculations to support acceptable performance of existing system and/or proposed upgrades to
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wastewater collection system.

12. Flow calculations will be necessary to determine private sewer lateral size and connecting locations to City sewer.

13. If electing to connect to City sewer through existing sewer connections, developer shall provide video on existing private sewer lateral(s) to determine the condition and any necessary work to be done on the lateral before construction. If private sewer lateral and wye are replaced, video will not be required.

D. Fire Department

1. **Addressing.** Mixed-use occupancy signs are required per City of Santa Barbara Municipal Code. Please note on plans that mixed-use addressing will be provided. (SBMC 8.04.030, Section 505.1.1)

2. **Project Directory.** A project directory, including a map and listing of all units on the site must be posted at the entrance to the property and must be indicated on the project plans. (SBMC 8.04, Section 505.3)

3. **Water Supply.** A COMMERCIAL type fire hydrant is required for this project as proposed. The hydrant must be located within 300 feet of all exterior walls by way of access. It must be provided with one (1) four inch (4") and two (2) two and one half (2 ½") outlets and must have a fire flow in excess of 1250 gallons per minute. (SBMC 8.04, Section 507.3 #2 and Section 507.5.1)

4. **Access.** COMMERCIAL driveway access shall be a minimum of 20 feet in width to within 150 feet of all exterior walls of the structure. Commercial access requirements also apply to driveways serving greater than three (3) residential units. The project, as proposed, does not meet this requirement. (SBMC 8.04 Section 503.1.1 and 503.2.1)

Driveway access for emergency vehicles must be all weather concrete or asphalt capable of supporting 60,000 pounds. (SBMC 8.04, Section 503.2.3)

5. **Fire Extinguishing System.** An automatic fire sprinkler system is required for this building under a separate permit. (SBMC 8.04, Section 903.2.20.1)

6. **Standpipe System.** A standpipe system is required for this building and must be provided under a separate permit. (CFC 905.3)

7. **Fire Alarm System.** A Mixed-Use Fire Alarm system is required. The alarm system must notify all occupants in the event of fire. The system must include automatic smoke detection throughout the entire complex and be provided with a notification system which indicates the presence of residential dwelling units. Please note on plans that a mixed-use fire alarm system will be provided under a separate permit. (SBMC 8.04, Section 907.2.30)

E. Transportation Division

1. **NZO CBD Change.** Note that the draft New Zoning Ordinance (NZO) extends the Central Business District to include this property, which would reduce the
nonresidential parking requirement to 1 space per 500 square feet. City Council will be reviewing the NZO on July 11, 2017.

2. Pedestrian Master Plan. New multi-family or nonresidential development projects typically include pedestrian improvements in the public right-of-way, and are subject to the guidelines and policies of the Pedestrian Master Plan (http://www.santabarbaraca.gov/gov/depts/pw/transpark/master_plans.asp).

Note that, for both frontages, the Pedestrian Master Plan recommends a 6 inch curb, 6 foot sidewalk, 4 foot furnishings zone, and 1.5 foot frontage zone, which may be on the private property.

Staff may seek dedication if widening is necessary to provide the recommended sidewalk corridor dimensions.

3. Corner Ramp. We anticipate that the corner sidewalk ramp will need to be replaced and the signal conduit relocated.

4. Standards for Parking Design. For all development, parking shall meet the Standards for Parking Design, which can be found on the City’s website at: http://www.santabarbaraca.gov/gov/depts/pw/transpark/project_review.asp

A thorough evaluation of parking will be provided when plans are submitted that include the required parking dimensions.

F. Building & Safety Division

1. The project must comply with the 2013 California Buildings Codes and the City of Santa Barbara Municipal Code Ordinance #5639.

2. Please indicate on the cover sheet that this project shall comply with all “accessibility” requirements of the 2013 C.B.C; Chapters 11A & 11B; 2010 ADA Standards and the FHA requirements. This project proposes to build 8 dwelling units & 1 commercial suite.

   (a) Per CBC 1106A.1 #2 in an elevatorcd building all units are required to be adaptable.

   (b) All adaptable units must comply with CBC 1128A which includes requirements for door widths, accessible routes and kitchen designs. In units that have more than one bathroom please show compliance with 1134A.2 Option 1 or 2. There are many elements in the design that do not appear to comply.

   (c) The AUD program requires an assigned parking space for each unit. Per CBC 11B-208.2.3.1 an accessible van stall is required for the residential use. Per CBC 11B-208.2 an additional van stall is required for the commercial unit.

3. Elevator Comments

   (a) Per CBC 3002.4 the elevator car shall be sized to accommodate a gurney.

   (b) Per CBC 1007 & 1007.3 An accessible means of egress is required from all floors. This can be provided with a stair enclosure or an elevator with
the required stand-by power. Please review 1007.2.1 for elevator requirements.

4. General Building Requirements

(a) A complete grading & drainage plan with calculations, soils report (geotechnical), geological report, architectural, structural plans and calculations will be required at the time of submittal for Building and Safety Division review.

(b) All utilities: power, telephones, cable TV, serving the proposed subdivision (including poles located on subject properties) shall be placed underground as required by City of Santa Barbara Municipal Code Chapter 22.38.

(c) On-Site Drainage Plan. A complete drainage plan, including pre- and post-construction run-off rates, that addresses the existing drainage patterns and leads towards improvement of the quality of water run-off conditions from the site. Any increase in the post construction run-off rates must be kept on site. The owner shall install any and all Best Management Practices (BMP's) needed to intercept drainage pollutants from the parking lot areas and other service areas prior to drainage discharge into the public storm drain system.

(d) Provide a complete code analysis, including Chapters 4, 5, 6, 7, and 9 of the CBC, which shall address building areas, building stories, fire resistive construction, allowable openings, fire sprinkler requirements, and distance from property lines.

(e) Per Table CBC 1016.2 the maximum travel distance is 250 feet w/sprinklers. Please confirm the travel distance and compliance with CBC 1019 Egress Balcony requirements. Please indicate compliance on the plans.

(f) Please provide an egress plan that clearly identifies the components of the egress system. Indicate the corridors, their respective widths and fire protection ratings; identify the exits components and the exit discharge.

(g) Per CBC 1026.5 Stairways at not allowed within 10 feet of the property line. Review section 1022.1 for the requirements for an interior stair enclosure.

(h) Per CBC Table 602 all construction within 10 feet of the property line shall be one-hour rated construction. Building will also require a parapet unless it meets the exceptions listed in this section.

(i) The garage meets the definition of an enclosed garage (CBC 406.6) and will require mechanical ventilation per CBC 406.6.2.

(j) Per CBC 1007 and Table 1021.2(2) it appears that two accessible means of egress are required in the parking garage. It is not clear where these two accessible routes are located.
(k) Please indicate the proposed separation at the walkway and the vehicular way. The plans do not clearly identify compliance with 11B-247.1.2.5.

5. Energy & Green Requirements
   (a) Per the 2016 Energy Regulations 110-10B 3c new buildings must have the electrical service panel designed to be "solar ready.
   (b) Per 2016 Green Code 4.106.4 New construction shall comply with sections 4.106.4.1 and 4.106.4.2 to facilitate future installation and the use of EV chargers. 3% of the parking spaces provided shall be "EV ready". If a charger is to be included then please indicate the accessible requirements for this feature. The addition of an EV charger may result in the loss of a parking space as an accessible station will be required. Please confirm with Planning that the future loss of a parking space is acceptable.
   (c) Per 2016 Green Code 5.106.5.2 designated parking for low-emitting, fuel efficient and car pool/van vehicle shall be provided in any combination. Per Table 5.106.5.2 identify

6. Additional Agency Reviews will be required. It is strongly suggested that the applicant meet with the respective agency see to review their requirements and the potential impacts their requirements may have on this project.
   (a) The trash enclosure will need to be of a sufficient size to provide trash, recycling and green waste containers. Please contact Karen Guntow at Environmental Services. Please also note that an accessible route of travel is required per 11B.
   (b) Prior to the issuance of a building permit clearance from the Air Pollution Control Department will be required.
   (c) A demolition permit will be required from the City of Santa Barbara.
   (d) A separate approval is required from the County of Santa Barbara.
   (e) Utility companies “Can & Will Serve Letters” from SCE, SoCal Gas, Verizon and Cox Cable will be required. Please coordinate the locations of anticipated meter and equipment locations and indicate this on the plans.

III. Applications Required

Based on the information submitted, the required applications would be:

A. Planning Division
   1. Planning Commission review of an Average Unit-Size Density Program project on a lot greater than 15,000 square feet (SBMC §28.20.080);
   2. A Development Plan to allow the construction of 3,563 square feet of nonresidential development (SBMC Chapter 28.85); and
   3. Design Review approval by the Historic Landmarks Commission (SBMC, Chapter 22.22).
B. **Engineering Division**

1. Certificate of Voluntary Merger Application (SBMC Chapter 27.30).

2. A separate public works permit will be required for all work performed in the public right-of-way.

IV. **REQUIRED ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FOR APPLICATION SUBMITTAL**

Staff has identified the following additional information as necessary in order to adequately review the proposed development project. Please ensure that your formal application submittal contains at least the following:

A. **Planning Division**

1. **Application Letter:** Your formal application letter should be addressed to the Planning Commission and should clearly identify what you are proposing, why you are making the proposal, and what permits/approvals you are seeking. The letter should specifically address how the project is consistent with the findings required for the requested approvals (e.g., Development Plan). This letter becomes a main attachment to the Planning Commission Staff Report. Refer to the Development Application Review Team Submittal Packet for additional details about information to include in the Application Letter.

2. **PRT Letter:** Submit a copy of this letter, indicating how each of the comments contained herein have been addressed.

3. **DART Submittal Packet.** Please provide all information identified in the Development Application Review Team Submittal Packet (available on the City’s website). Be sure to clearly identify required setbacks and outdoor living space on the plans. The plans shall include all the information and plans identified in our Project Plan Requirements handout.

4. **Zoning Plan Check:**

   a. Building Height/Stories. The maximum vertical height of a building or structure at all points measured from natural or finished grade, whichever is lower. Architectural elements that do not add floor area to a building, such as chimneys, vents, antennae, and towers, are not considered a part of the height of a building, but all portions of the roof are included. Based on the information provided, it is not clear whether the Residential Lounge complies with the height/story limitations. Provide additional sections through this portion of the building so that staff can confirm compliance.

   b. Show required commercial bicycle parking (4 spaces based on vehicle parking requirement of 27 spaces).

   c. Update the Project Statistics on Sheet G001 related to the allowed use at each parcel and associated square footage, based on Attachment 2.

   d. Sheet G005 is incomplete with regard to unit sizes. Include all units, or remove, as the same information is shown on G001. Show the location of the Fire Department-required project directory on the site plan.
c. SWMP.

- Include a description of proposed storm water BMPs in scope of work or project description on the Architectural plan cover sheet.
- Include the locations of all BMPs on the Architectural site plan and provide a reference to the details on the Civil sheets.
- Include the amount of proposed new impervious area and the amount of proposed replaced impervious area in the project statistics of the Architectural plan cover sheet. New impervious area includes existing permeable surfaces that will be impervious after the project is complete. Replaced impervious area includes existing impervious surfaces that will be replaced with impervious surfaces once the project is complete.

5. Minor and Small Addition Floor Area. If you would like retain credit for any available Minor or Small Addition Floor Area following the proposed lot merger, please submit a site plan for each parcel showing how that potential floor area could be developed on the lot in compliance with current zoning standards (assuming surface parking).

6. Technical Studies:

a. Archeological Resources. The subject parcels are located within several Archeological Resource areas. A Phase I Archeological Report will be required for the proposed development. The Phase I Archaeology Report is required to be prepared and submitted for review and acceptance by the Historic Landmarks Commission as part of the project’s environmental review. A list of the submittal requirements for the required report and the List of City Approved Archaeological Consultants are available on the City website. Please be sure that one copy of the report contains the original photographs, and that the remaining copies contain legibly reproduced photographs. Please note that Phase I Archeological Reports must be reviewed and accepted by the Historic Landmarks Commission (HLC) at a full board hearing before we can make an environmental determination and before the project can be scheduled for Project Design Approval by the HLC.

b. Historic Structures Report. A Historic Structures Report analyzing the significance of existing structures and the impact of the proposed development on those structures must be accepted by the HLC.

c. Hydrology (SWMP) Report. The hydrology/storm water report should include:

- A description of the existing site and proposed project (map optional).
- Site assessment (see Chapter 2 of the BMP Guidance Manual).
- BMP Selection and associated capacities (see Appendix C and Appendix D of BMP Guidance Manual for sizing methodologies and worksheets).
Include worksheets from Appendix D for all BMPs, to demonstrate adequate sizing.

- Provide a map or diagram dividing the developed portions of the project site into discrete Drainage Management Areas (DMAs). Indicate all BMPs on the map/diagram for each DMA.

- Soil report including infiltration testing results (see Chapter 3 of the BMP Guidance Manual for methodology).

- Storm Water Calculations including a narrative summary discussing calculated results and addressing how each of the three Tier 3 components (treatment requirement (1"), 24-hr. storm), peak runoff discharge rate, and volume reduction requirements for the entire project site) will be met. See Appendix C in the Guidance Manual. This information must be summarized/confirmed up front in the report without searching through the hydrocad calculations in the appendices.

- Call out the total flow (volume) that needs to be treated and/or retained, specify the proposed storm water design treatment capacities, and demonstrate that this amount of flow is treated by the specified BMPs.

- Create a section in the report titled “Peak Runoff Discharge Rate.” In this section, provide a narrative discussion of how proposed BMPs meet the peak runoff discharge rate requirements. Storm water runoff BMPs shall provide detention such that the post-development peak storm water runoff discharge rate shall not exceed the pre-development rate for the 2-, 5-, 10-, and 25-year 24-hour storm events.

- Create a section in the report titled “Volume Reduction.” In this section include a discussion of the total volume reduction that needs to be retained, make sure to discuss retention on-site of the larger of the following two volumes from the entire project site:
  - The volume difference between the pre- and post-conditions for the 25-year, 24-hour design storm (for redevelopment, the pre-condition is the predevelopment condition).
  - The volume generated from a one-inch, 24-hr storm event for the entire project site.

This information must be summarized/confirmed up front in the report without searching through the hydrocad calculations in the appendices.

- Provide a table listing all drainage areas, the required 24-hour treatment volume for each drainage area and the provided treatment capacity of each BMP. An accompanying exhibit with the parcel split into drainage areas with the BMPs should be included.

- Proposed BMPs must comply with specifications described in Chapter 6 of the BMP Guidance Manual. Include cross-section details of all proposed BMPs that demonstrate compliance with these requirements.
- **Summary and Conclusions** - must include confirmation that total BMP capacities meet/exceed the post-development runoff requirements (e.g. "1 inch, 24 hour storm required BMP capacity = 2000 cu. ft., permeable paver capacity provided = 3000 cu. ft.").

d. **Construction Plan.** In order to evaluate short term construction-related traffic, parking, air quality and noise impacts, provide a construction plan for each phase of construction (e.g. demolition, grading, construction, landscaping) that delineates the following:

  - the estimated number of truck trips,
  - an estimate of the length of construction time for each phase of construction including hours per day and total days,
  - the types of equipment necessary for each phase and how long they would be used, including hours per day and total days,
  - the number of construction workers on site daily during each phase, and
  - the location(s) of construction staging and construction worker parking.

c. **Tree Survey.** Provide a Plan showing each existing tree with a diameter at four feet, six inches above existing grade of four inches or greater, and its dripline (the dripline of the tree is defined as the outside edge of the leaf canopy). On the Plan, call out the tree's diameter and provide a reference (e.g. abbreviated common name and number). For each tree shown, include a reference table identifying each tree (by reference number), botanic and common name, and its condition rating based on the ISA guide to tree appraisal, indicating if the tree has decay, disease, insects or other damage.

  On same plan, show all proposed development, (including structure footings, grading and fill, and utilities), with potential for impacts to existing trees (4 inch diameter or greater at a height of 4'-6" above). All trees to be removed shall be indicated with an “X” drawn through the tree.

B. **Transportation Division**

1. **Plan Information.**

   a. Show widths of sidewalk corridor and existing and proposed curb cuts.

   b. Show bay widths, parking space widths, and overhead clearances. Provide additional sections though the parking garage. Identify any pedestrian access to the garage.

   c. Identify which parking spaces will be assigned to the residential units.

   d. Show pedestrian visibility triangle at each driveway.

   e. Provide details on the bike room and specify bike rack model(s).
f. Identify expected use of the commercial space.

g. Unit sizes reported on G005 are inconsistent with unit sizes on G001. Please reconcile.

V. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:

Determining the level of environmental review is dependent on a thorough project description in the applicant letter that provides information about the existing setting (e.g., size of the parcel, amount of development, use of buildings, natural habitat on site, easements, etc.) and the proposed project (e.g., demolition of structures, grading, habitat removal, uses of the site, restoration or structures and/or natural habitat, etc.).

Once the formal application has been received and deemed complete, staff will begin the environmental review of the subject development application. During this period, you may be contacted to discuss measures to avoid or reduce environmental effects anticipated to result from the proposed project.

VI. FEES

Please be informed that fees are subject to change at a minimum annually (on July 1st). Additionally, any fees required following Planning Commission approval will be assessed during the Building Plan Check phase and shall be paid prior to issuance of the building permit. Based on the information submitted, the subject project requires the following additional fees for the following reasons:

A. Planning Division

Prior to the application being deemed complete:

Development Plan Review Fee (if 1,001-3,000 sf) .................................. $1,415.00

or

Development Plan Review Fee (if 3,001-10,000 sf) ........................... $11,365.00

HLC Review of Historic Structures Report Fee ............................... $275.00

Environmental Review Fee ................................................................. $805.00*

Planning Commission Concept Review Fee ........................................... PAID

HLC Review Fee .............................................................................. PAID

Mailing List Service Fee (per noticed hearing) .............................. $235.00

Following HLC approval:

Zoning Plan Check Fee ................................................................. TBD

* Only required if DART review is required (i.e. if Development Plan for >3,000 sf is required).

B. Engineering Division

Following HLC approval:

Certificate of Voluntary Lot Merger ................................................... $1,591.00

Driveway aprons (2) ........................................................................ $482.00

Sidewalk ....................................................................................... $1,500.00

Curb and Gutter .............................................................................. $1,500.00
C. **Water Resources Division**  
Fee ................................................................................................................... TBD

D. **Transportation Division**  
*Following HLC approval:*  
Fee ................................................................................................................... TBD

E. **Building & Safety Division**  
*Following HLC approval:*  
Plan Check Fee ............................................................................................ TBD

VII. **Next Steps:**  
1. HLC review and acceptance of Historic Structures Report  
2. HLC review and acceptable of Phase 1 Archaeological Resources Report  
3. HLC Concept Review  
4. DART application submitted for completeness review *(if applicable).*  
5. DART application reviewed for completeness by City staff *(if applicable).*  
6. Determination of Environmental Review process. This may include the preparation of an Initial Study and a determination as to whether a Mitigated Negative Declaration or an Environmental Impact Report would be required.  
7. Planning Commission review of Development Plan *(if applicable)* and comments on AUD project.  
8. HLC Project Design and Final Approvals

*Please Note: The Planning Commission conducts regular site visits to project sites, generally the Tuesday morning prior to the scheduled hearing date. The Commission has requested that markers be provided on the site for all projects that may have size, bulk, and scale, and/or visual impacts or view issues, to provide a basic visual representation of project size and scale.*

*Please be sure to place stakes at the corners of the proposed new buildings/additions and story poles located at the roof ridge line (the highest point of the roof) and the eave. Any large trees to be protected/removed should also be identified.*

*Also note that you will also be required to post the public notice on the site in accordance to current noticing requirements.*

VIII. **Contacts**

The following is a list of the contact personnel for the various City departments and/or divisions working on the processing of your application:

Planning Division, 564-5470, ext. 4552 ........ Allison De Busk, Project Planner  
Fire Department, 564-5702 ......................... Amber Anderson, Fire Inspector I or Brady Beck, Fire Fighter  
Engineering Division, 564-5363 ................. Adam Hendel, Principal Civil Engineer or Jesus Banuelos, Project Engineer II  
Water Resources Division, 564-5406 .......... Maggi Heinrich, Water Resources Specialist
IX. CONCLUSIONS/GENERAL COMMENTS

These comments constitute your PRT review. The project is scheduled for review at a meeting on Tuesday, July 18, 2017 at 1:15 p.m. with staff from the Planning, Engineering, Water Resources, Transportation, and Building & Safety Divisions and the Fire Department. Please review this letter carefully prior to our scheduled meeting date. We will answer your questions on the PRT comments at that time. If you do not feel it is necessary to meet with staff to discuss the contents of the letter or the project, please call me at (805) 564-5470 by Monday, July 17, 2017. If we do not hear from you by this date, we will assume that you will be attending the scheduled meeting.

Prior to submitting a formal DART application, please make an appointment with me to review the materials and ensure that all of the required items are included in the application package. If you have any general or process questions, please feel free to contact me.

X. EXPIRATION OF PRT COMMENTS

Comments and recommendations from any pre-application review are valid for a period of 12 months from the date of the Pre-Application Review Team letter. If a project is substantially revised, or if applicable policies, regulations, or procedures change that could affect the recommendations or conclusions of the pre-application review, the Team may require a subsequent pre-application review prior to formal application submittal. If, however, there are no substantial changes to either the project or any relevant policies, regulations, and procedures, the Team may allow the submittal of an application for a development project up to a maximum of 24 months after the date of the Pre-Application Review Team letter.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Allison De Busk
Project Planner

Attachments:

1. Applicable General Plan Policies
2. Approved On-Site Development

cc: (w/o attachments)
Barranca Enterprises, Inc., 232 E. Anapamu Street, Santa Barbara, ca 93101
Planning File
Adam Hendel, Principal Civil Engineer
Jesus Banuelos, Project Engineer II
Brad Rahrer, Project Engineer II/Wastewater
Applicable General Plan Policies
226-232 E. Anapamu St.; 1117 & 1121 Garden Street, 223 E. Figueroa St. G & H

Land Use Element

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.

LG3. Live Within Our Resources. New development shall be monitored to ensure that we are living within our resources through a comprehensive Adaptive Management Program.

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.

LG5. Community Benefit Housing. While acknowledging the need to balance the provision of affordable housing with market-rate housing, new residential development in multi-family and commercial zones, including mixed-use projects, should include affordable housing and open space benefits.

Possible Implementation Actions to be Considered

LG5.1 Affordable Housing. Develop standards and project level findings to encourage the development of Community Benefit Housing defined as:

- Rental housing;
- Housing affordable to low, moderate, or middle income households;
- Employer sponsored workforce housing;
- Limited Equity Co-operative Housing;
- Affordable Housing Downtown for Downtown Workers; and/or
- Transitional housing, single residential occupancy, and other housing for special needs populations including seniors, physically or mentally disabled, homeless, and children aging out of foster care.
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.

LG9. Multigenerational Facilities and Services. The City recognizes that there is an increasing need for multigenerational facilities and services. The City shall encourage development which provides for multigenerational facilities and services.


LG12. Community Character. Strengthen and enhance design and development review standards and process to enhance community character, promote affordable housing, and further community sustainability principles.

LG12.2 Building Size, Bulk and Scale. Ensure that proposed buildings are compatible in scale with the surrounding built environment.

a. Standards and Findings. Strengthen and expand building size, bulk and scale standards and findings for development projects of 10,000 square feet or more in the commercial zones to ensure compatibility with surrounding uses, particularly historic resources and residential neighborhoods.

b. Floor Area Ratios (FARs). Develop a set of maximum FARs for the non-residential and High Density areas of the City, with particular attention to protecting historic resources and areas that are adjacent to single family zoned areas, maintaining Santa Barbara's small town character, and encouraging small, affordable residential units.

i) Maximums. Develop a set of maximum FARs that permit the largest structures in the center of the city (adjacent to transit and commercial services), and reduce maximum building size/FARs moving outward from the center. (This approval would be similar to the "Parking Zone of Benefit" model);

ii) Buffers. On parcels adjoining historic structures, establish "buffers" using more restrictive FAR limits;

iii) Incentives. Consider higher FARs for multi-family rental projects and small, affordable residential units; and

iv) Guidelines. Consider FAR Guidelines for development models such as where parking is proposed at the ground or in basement floors.

v) Development Community. Create a working group that includes local professionals from the development community when developing FARs.

c. Development Monitoring. Develop a program to monitor the scale and pace of development within the City; take action where transformative developments may occur along a block or corridor to guide development along that corridor.

d. Community Character Preservation. Include in design guidelines that as part of any major new in-fill development or remodel, consider the context of the proposed structure in relation to surrounding uses and parcels along the entire block; ensure that the proposed development will not eliminate or preclude preservation of the key visual assets of the particular block or corridor, including landmark structures, structures of merit, potentially historic structures, key scenic view points that provide unique or important views to the surrounding hills, and specimen trees and other important visual resources. Require building design modifications as needed to preserve essential elements of the community character along that block or corridor.
LG12.3 Building Set-Backs. The frontage of commercial buildings Downtown should have variation in building setback along the street facades to make the streetscape more interesting.

a. Guidelines and Standards. Prepare guidelines and, as necessary, Zoning Ordinance standards for the use, design, and landscaping of the street frontage for commercial buildings in Downtown, consistent with the Pedestrian Master Plan and Urban Design Guidelines. Where suitable, the building set-back should accommodate significant trees, consistent with fire safety and protection of public views.

b. Pedestrian Environment. Provide for a successful pedestrian environment including the promotion of canopy trees to be integrated into projects and along the public streets.

Housing Element

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.

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.

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.

H12. Above Moderate Affordable Housing. Provide incentives for the private sector development of new housing opportunities affordable to households earning more than 120% of the Area Median Income, but not more than 200% of the Area Median Income.


H14. Sustainable Housing. Ensure that new market-rate residential development is consistent with the City’s sustainability goal, including reduced energy and resource use, and increased affordable housing opportunities.

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.

H21. Preserve Affordable Housing. Maintain the affordability of existing extremely low, very low, low and moderate income dwelling units.

Historic Resources Element

HR1. Protect Historic and Archaeological Resources. Protect the heritage of the City by preserving, protecting and enhancing historic resources and archaeological resources. Apply available governmental resources, devices and approaches, such as the measures enumerated in the Land Use Element of this Plan, to facilitate their preservation and protection.
HR2. Ensure respectful and compatible development. Seek to ensure that all development within the City respects rather than detracts from individual historic and archaeological resources as well as the neighborhood and the overall historical character of the city. Assure compatibility of development, respect for the historical context of historical resources, and consideration of sustainable design alternatives where compatible.

HR3. Discourage Demolition. Develop effective measures to discourage and curtail the demolition of historic resources.

HR4. Pursue Adaptive Reuse. Encourage the adaptation of historic buildings or structures for uses other than the original intended use when the original use is no longer viable.

HR5. Protect Neighborhood Historic Resources. Identify neighborhoods in the city that have substantially maintained historical character, and pursue measures to preserve that character. Protect such neighborhoods, especially those in close proximity to the downtown and commercial cores, from development that might transform their historic character.

HR6. Protect Traditional Public Resources and Streetscapes. Identify and preserve significant public resources and streetscapes and ensure a public review process in order to protect their historical features and attributes.

Environmental Resources Element

ER5. Energy Efficiency and Conservation. As part of the City's strategy for addressing climate change, minimizing pollution of air and water, depleting nonrenewable resources and insulating from volatility of fossil fuel prices, dependence on energy derived from fossil fuels shall be reduced through increased efficiency, conservation, and conversion to renewable energy sources when practicable and financially warranted.

ER6. Local and Regional Renewable Energy Resources. Provide both within the city, and regionally through working with the County and other local jurisdictions or parties, opportunities to preserve, promote and participate in the development of local renewable energy resources such as solar, wind, geothermal, wave, hydro, methane and waste conversion.

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.

ER30. Enhance Visual Quality. Not only retain, but improve visual quality of the city wherever practicable.
Conservation Element (1979, prior amendment 1994)

**VISUAL RESOURCES**

**Policies / Implementation Strategies**

3.0 New development shall not obstruct scenic view corridors, including those of the ocean and lower elevations of the City viewed respectively from the shoreline and upper foothills, and of the upper foothills and mountains viewed respectively from the beach and lower elevations of the City.

4.0 Trees enhance the general appearance of the City’s landscape and should be preserved and protected.
   4.1 Mature trees should be integrated into project design rather than removed. The Tree Ordinance should be reviewed to ensure adequate provision for review of protection measures proposed for the preservation of trees in the project design.
   4.2 All feasible options should be exhausted prior to the removal of trees.
   4.3 Major trees removed as a result of development or other property improvement shall be replaced by specimen trees on a minimum one-for-one basis.
   4.4 Private efforts to increase the number of street trees throughout the City should be encouraged.

**AIR QUALITY**

**Policies / Implementation Strategies**

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

**BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES**

**Policies / Implementation Strategies**

2.0 Redevelopment and renovation of the central city shall be encouraged in order to preserve existing resources.
Circulation Element

C1. Transportation Infrastructure Enhancement and Preservation. Assess the current and potential demand for alternative transportation and where warranted increase the availability and attractiveness of alternative transportation by improving related infrastructure and facilities without reducing vehicle access.

C7. Parking Management. Manage parking Downtown to reduce congestion, increase economic vitality, and preserve Santa Barbara’s quality of life.

Circulation Element (1997, original 1964)

POLICIES AND IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

1.1 The City shall establish, maintain, and expand a mobility system that supports the economic vitality of local businesses.

1.1.1 Optimize access and parking for customers in business areas by implementing policies of the Circulation Element aimed at reducing dependence upon the automobile, and improving and increasing pedestrian, bicycle use, and transit use.

1.1.2 Review traffic impact standards used at City intersections for consistency with the goals of the Circulation Element and General Plan through public workshops with the Planning Commission and the City Council.

1.1.3 Enhance alternative transportation services and infrastructure access between residential, recreational, educational, institutional and commercial areas.

1.1.4 Provide adequate infrastructure and info-structure to support the delivery of goods and services to and from area businesses.

4.2 The City shall work to expand, enhance, and maintain the system of bikeways to serve current community needs and to develop increased ridership for bicycle transportation and recreation.

4.2.3 Encourage facilities for bicycle travel and parking in any future development, construction, or reconstruction projects during the review of new development and infrastructure improvements. Bicycle facilities can be achieved through methods such as:
- purchase, dedication, and other means of property acquisition.
- conditions of approval,
- expanding the scope of maintenance projects, and
- enforcement of the Santa Barbara Municipal Code, Parking Section.

8.5 The City shall promote/facilitate the development of housing to decrease the need for parking through an increased walking/biking population that lives, works, and shops in the Downtown (See Chapter 13).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Approved Nonresidential Square Footage</th>
<th>Small Addition Status</th>
<th>Minor Addition Status</th>
<th>Approved Residential Units</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>226 E. Anapamu St.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,000 sf available</td>
<td>1,000 sf available</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 parking spaces provided to 228 E Anapamu per unilateral agreement 1982. BLD2013-00649 to return to 1 residence; ZCD reqd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228 E. Anapamu St.</td>
<td>1,640 sf</td>
<td>2,000 sf available¹</td>
<td>1,000 sf available²</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1982 PC approved conversion from residential to office (required 3 off-site parking spaces). BLD2013-00648 to return to legal office configuration; ZCD reqd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230 E. Anapamu St.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,000 sf available¹</td>
<td>1,000 sf available¹</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>BLD2013 to restore to legal configuration; ZCD required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232 E. Anapamu St.</td>
<td>1,445 sf</td>
<td>2,000 sf available²</td>
<td>1,000 sf available¹</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1948 permit issued to convert dwelling to offices and add 2-family structure to rear. No parking. ZCD recorded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1117 Garden St.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,000 sf available²</td>
<td>1,000 sf available¹</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Re-zoned from R-3 to R-O in 1978; per street file</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1121 Garden St.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,000 sf available²</td>
<td>1,000 sf available¹</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Per street file</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223 E. Figueroa St. G</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,000 sf available²</td>
<td>1,000 sf available¹</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223 E. Figueroa St. H</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,000 sf available²</td>
<td>1,000 sf available¹</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ No room for additional surface parking; unlikely additional non-residential square footage could be achieved.
² No room for additional surface parking; could potentially convert portion of residential to maintain nonconforming parking status.
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