



City of Santa Barbara
PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES
JULY 19, 2018

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

COMMISSION MEMBERS:

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

STAFF:

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

CALL TO ORDER

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

I. ROLL CALL

Chair Lesley Wiscomb, Commissioners John P. Campanella, Mike Jordan, Deborah L. Schwartz, and Addison Thompson

Absent: Vice Chair Sheila Lodge and Commissioner Jay D. Higgins

STAFF PRESENT

N. Scott Vincent, Assistant City Attorney
 Beatriz Gularte, Senior Planner
 Dan Gullett, Supervising Transportation Planner
 Allison De Busk, Project Planner
 Megan Arciniega, Associate Planner
 Nicole Hernandez, Associate Planner/Urban Historian
 Krystal M. Vaughn, Commission Secretary

II. PRELIMINARY MATTERS

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

No requests.

B. Announcements and appeals:

Ms. Gularte announced the Planning Commission Meeting of August 9, 2018 will be cancelled.

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

1. June 14, 2018 Minutes.

MOTION: Jordan/Schwartz

Approve the minutes as presented.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 4 Noes: 0 Abstain: 1 (Thompson) Absent: 2 (Higgins and Lodge)

2. June 21, 2018 Minutes

3. PC Resolution No. 018-18
General Plan Amendment and Local Coastal Program Amendment

MOTION: Jordan/Thompson

Approve the minutes and resolutions as presented.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 4 Noes: 0 Abstain: 1 (Campanella) Absent: 2 (Higgins and Lodge)

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

No public comment.

III. CONTINUED ITEM CONTINUED FROM JUNE 14, 2018

ACTUAL TIME: 1:05 P.M.

APPLICATION OF ROGER HOLCOMBE, PROPERTY OWNER, 2111 EDGEWATER WAY, APN 041-350-017, E-3/SD-3 ZONES, GENERAL PLAN AND LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM LAND USE DESIGNATION: LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL, 5 DU/AC (MST2017-00079)

The project consists of a remodel to an existing 2,734 square foot single residential unit with a 484 square foot detached two-car garage. The remodel consists of replacing the exterior doors and windows, new siding, repainting, reconfiguring the entry porch, new air conditioning, and a re-roof to adjust the roof slope and replace the existing composition shingles with new charcoal gray composition shingles. Other site improvements include minor foundation improvements, new landscaping, drainage improvements, and minor hardscape alterations. No new square footage is proposed to the existing residence. The project would abate violations identified in ENF2017-017417.

A Coastal Development Permit (CDP2018-00004) is required to allow the proposed development in the Appealable Jurisdiction of the City's Coastal Zone (SBMC §28.44.060).

The Environmental Analyst has determined that the project is exempt from further environmental review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines Sections 15301, Existing Facilities and 15304, Minor Alterations to Land.

ACTUAL TIME: 1:05 P.M.

Megan Arciniega, Associate Planner, gave the Staff presentation.

Roger Holcombe gave the Applicant presentation and was joined by Steve Campbell, Engineering Geologist.

Public comment opened at 1:42 p.m., and as no one wished to speak, it closed.

MOTION: Jordan/Schwartz

Assigned Resolution No. 019-018

Approve the project, making the findings for the Coastal Development Permit as outlined in the Staff Report dated July 12, 2018, subject to the Conditions of Approval as outlined in the Staff Report, with the addition of Condition II.D.2.g: Soil testing must occur and be submitted to Community Development prior to Building Permit Issuance, in a form that is acceptable to the City's Chief Building Official.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

The ten calendar day appeal period was announced.

*** THE COMMISSION RECESSED FROM 1:49 TO 2:00 P.M. ***

IV. NEW ITEM

ACTUAL TIME: 2:00 P.M.

APPLICATION OF MELISA TURNER, DESIGNARC, AGENT FOR BARRANCA ENTERPRISES, INC. AND MLG LEASING, INC.; 226-232 E. ANAPAMU ST., 1117 & 1121 GARDEN ST., AND 223 E. FIGUEROA ST. UNITS G & H; APN 029-162-006, -007, -008, -009, -010, -012, -020, -021; O-R (OFFICE RESTRICTED) ZONE, GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: OFFICE – HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL / PRIORITY HOUSING OVERLAY (MST2017-00092)

The proposed project involves the construction of a 63,982 square foot mixed-use development with 52 residential units and 6,084 square feet of nonresidential floor area. The project is proposed 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 buildings and improvements, except two Queen Anne Free Classic style homes located at 228 and 230 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 mixed-use development that includes 41,384 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. 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 54 spaces would be allocated to the residential development, with 6 surplus spaces provided. The majority of the parking spaces would be provided in parking lifts (“stacked parking”).

The residential development includes 52 residential units with an average unit size of 752 square feet and a unit mix of 15 studio, 9 one-bedroom, 24 two-bedroom and 4 three-bedroom units.

The eight parcels have a zoning classification of O-R (Office Restricted) and 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 would be 63 dwelling units per acre.

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.

This project requires Planning Commission Conceptual Review because the combined lot size is more than 15,000 square feet and the project is being proposed under the AUD Incentive Program Priority Housing Overlay. The purpose of this hearing is for Planning Commission and the public to review the proposed project design and provide the applicant, staff, and the Historic Landmarks Commission (HLC) with comments on the proposed improvements, design, and General Plan consistency (SBMC §30.150.060.E).

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

Allison De Busk, Project Planner, gave the Staff presentation. Nicole Hernandez, City’s Urban Historian and Dan Gullett, Transportation Planning Supervisor, were available to answer questions.

Bill Mahan, HLC Commissioner, explained that the HLC has no purview over parking, unit count, or number of bedrooms. Commissioner Mahan believes the project has made good progress and an appropriate design can be achieved through the design review process.

Steve Hausz, HLC Commissioner, noted that the HLC needs to find a balance between housing and neighborhood compatibility. The HLC found that this project needs to be reduced in size to achieve neighborhood compatibility.

Melisa Turner, Sr. Project Manager; Mark Kirkhart, Principal Planner; and Mark Shields, Sr. Designer gave the Applicant presentation, and were joined by Phil Suding, Landscape Architect; Alex Cole, Historian; and Greg Reitz, Applicant.

Public comment opened at 3:40 p.m.

The following people spoke in support:

1. Shannon Batcher, Executive Administrator for the Coastal Housing Coalition (CHC), commented that after review of the project, the CHC endorses the project as it will provide much needed workforce housing for local employees. Explained that lack of housing adversely affects the local economy.
2. Amanda Landon, manager of the Marc apartments, expressed that the project will create

affordable housing and fills the need for more housing.

3. Ellen Bildsten, explained that although the project is very large in scope, it is designed in a very sensitive and historically appropriate way. The project's location encourages sustainable transportation such as walking and biking, promotes the city's economic growth by incorporating convenient commercial space with street engagement, the existing public transportation centers near the site aid in the project's compatibility, and the project will provide much needed affordable housing.
4. Jason Jewell understands that change is uncomfortable and the desire to preserve the character of Santa Barbara; however, it is needed for the City to thrive. The project brings with it a sense of community and will draw in young people to revive the community, promoting walking, ride sharing, and biking.
5. Christos Celmayster explained that since the project is so close to the core of downtown it will draw the community to the downtown area to support local businesses.
6. Steve Harrel, though the project is large, he thinks it is well designed and supports the project being broken up into smaller buildings. Because of its location, it will be a benefit to the ADA community who need close access to the downtown district. He also agrees with the comments made by the previous speakers.
7. Addison Proctor, understands that change is difficult; however, with the changes already affecting the downtown and the City's current housing shortage, this intelligently designed and sustainable minded project will help the downtown and our housing shortage.
8. Brian Resendiz stated that there is a low vacancy rate in the City of Santa Barbara for renters and this project helps with that deficit and will be a net-positive.
9. Written correspondence in support from Elisa Garcia, Coastal Housing Coalition (signed by Board Member Jon Standing), and Dan Ferrick was acknowledged.

The following people spoke in opposition or with concerns:

1. Jose Arturo Gallegos explained that the development proposed is too massive for the neighborhood which consist of mostly bungalow courts and cottages. AUD projects are not affordable and will push out the working class of Santa Barbara, and are creating a mini Manhattan. Ann Leatherman ceded her time to Mr. Gallegos.
2. Ariane Schmidt Clausius explained that the proposed project is a monstrosity and the size should not be compared to a church or the Courthouse. The project will not be affordable and will create more traffic and less affordable housing. This project does not blend in with the neighborhood. Santa Barbara's charm is being lost and turned into Orange County. Greg Corso ceded his time to Ms. Clausius.
3. Yesenia Vega Chavolla noted that lack of affordable rental housing is affecting all of Santa Barbara and this 52 unit apartment project will not aid in the city's workforce housing deficit since the starting rent will cost more than 30% of the median household income in Santa Barbara, not including utilities. If the project were going to truly provide affordable housing, rents (including utilities) should start at \$1,629 or less.
4. Mary Whittmer-Lysek noted that she is pro density but is also pro balance; this is a close-knit neighborhood; the scale of this project is too large and needs to be reduced.
5. Steve Hoegerman stated that the project is too large for the community, will destroy the unique community found within the courtyard off Figueroa Street, and will tower over the small units it surrounds thereby eliminating natural light and privacy. Preserve Santa Barbara, save this neighborhood. Teresa Everett and Yasar Hussain ceded their time to Mr. Hogerman.
6. Mr. Estrada echoes Mr. Hoegerman's comments and explained that though he supports AUD developments generally, this project is not a good use of the AUD program, the project does

not fit with the character of the neighborhood - it is too large, and will destroy and disrupt the existing community.

7. Alison Galindo expressed appreciation for the story poles. She explained that the project is an extreme and unwanted change to the neighborhood; it is too massive and will encourage trespassing onto the remaining bungalows. Noted traffic and parking concerns. The project should be reduced to two stories.
8. David Walker supports the impulse to housing density through mixed use buildings in the downtown; however, only when it is done correctly and commensurate the neighborhood's size bulk and scale, instead of undercutting it. Expressed concern with this project's size and scale, parking, traffic, affordability, displacement, and access. Doesn't want access to be provided through the 223 E. Figueroa driveway.
9. Megan Illgner stated that the existing neighborhood is perfect and that the project will create more problems than it solves. The project will impose dense overcrowding, inadequate parking, and will aid in pushing out the middle class. Are we a small town or a big city?
10. Natalia Govoni stated that the mass size and bulk of the project is out of scale with the community and will destroy the neighborhood.
11. Therise Schweidler stated that the massive development will be devastating and will remove all the beauty of the community.
12. Clarissa Chenovick stated that the massive development will negatively impact the neighborhood's character and will impose parking and traffic issues in an already saturated area.
13. Josephine DiLoreto agrees with Ms. Chenovick and stated that a smaller project would be preferred.
14. Jamie Bishop expressed horror and anxiety over the story poles. Stated that the project will negatively impact parking, is inconsistent and incompatible with the neighborhood, will impose more traffic in an already saturated area of town, and will create a canyonized/maze-like setting of the area.
15. Warren Wood agrees with all previous speakers and echoed that the large project will negatively impact the already dense and loud neighborhood. There is already lots of traffic at this corner.
16. Nancy Weiss stated that she is grateful for all the work that has taken place thus far to reduce the project; however, more reductions need to take place and a two story project is more appropriate for the neighborhood. Adjustments should be made so as to not dwarf the existing Queen Anne structures. Ms. Weiss asked that a full Environmental Impact Report be completed on the project to address traffic, parking, views, historic resources and open space. She would like the project to return to the Planning Commission for review.
17. Paul Kontos stated that the development's size, bulk, and scale is unfathomable. Considering the density of the project, the size and scale should be reduced to maintain livability in the neighborhood.
18. Wendy Foster understands the need to draw people to the downtown to support businesses; however, the project is too massive and needs to be scaled down.
19. Cathie McCammon expressed that a neighborhood is not defined by churches, court houses, and government buildings; the proposed project is not compatible with its surrounding neighborhood, is pushing the envelope with regard to the number of units being proposed, has insufficient parking, and the height needs to be reduced; and the project will not implement affordable housing. It needs to be smaller.
20. Lisa Ballantine explained that the project will negatively impact the community, especially the views from the Methodist Church, and will dramatically change the views and erode/destroy the character of the neighborhood. Noted the canyonization of Anapamu Street and the

impact on traffic.

21. Donny Brubaker stated that the area is already saturated with foot and vehicle traffic and the proposed development will cause additional parking problems and damage the character of the neighborhood.
22. Shelby Smith explained that residential buildings over two stories do not exist on the block or in the surrounding area and most residential buildings are single story homes; the proposed development is too large, will damage the character of the neighborhood, and will negatively impact street parking and traffic. Keep Santa Barbara historic, quaint and charming.
23. Theron Kontos stated that the proposed height and scope of the development is intrusive, imposing, and will damage the integrity of the adjacent historic motor court bungalows. The development should not impose any changes to the existing motor court, should start beyond the last bungalow, and be no more than two stories high. The project will negatively impact street parking and traffic.
24. Nonie Hamilton concurs with a number comments that have already been expressed and takes particular issue with the project being discussed as affordable since it will cost \$3,000 for a one bedroom apartment. She stated that the existing owner let the buildings fall into disrepair.
25. Christine Neuhauser stated that the size, bulk, and scale of the project are out of proportion with the existing neighborhood; the project overwhelms the one- and two- story Craftsman and Victorian houses that currently exist, and will change the look of the area for both pedestrians and those that traverse the area daily. Noted loss of views.
26. Lisa James stated that the size, bulk, and scale is much grander than what is acceptable for the neighborhood, the north looming wall imposes on the streetscape. Traffic is a nightmare now and there are existing safety issues, so it is hard to picture how additional cars will impact that. We need housing but this is not the solution.
27. Anna Marie Gott expressed that the proposed project will not be affordable by many individuals employed by downtown businesses as most people downtown work in food service. This project has no inclusionary requirement and will not provide affordable housing. The residents in the neighborhood that the proposed project will affect showed up today because they are concerned not only with high rents but the negative impact the project will impose on their community. In 1991 there was a parking study done that found a 1,600 parking space deficit and projected a 2,300 parking space deficit, which in reality we are probably past by now. Ivy Ireland ceded her time to Ms. Gott.
28. Written correspondence in opposition or with concerns from Maria Brant, Steve Hoegerman, William R. Sandoval, Citizens Planning Association (signed by Marell Brooks and Besty R. Cramer), Raylene Crawford, Stephen MacFarlane, Teresa Everett, Reina Hernandez, Susan Garrett, Mary Myers, Paulina Conn, Madisyn Taylor, Laura Rhoads, Susanne Wood and William Chiplis, Douglas Imperato, Jamie Bishop, Susan Garrett, The Kelly Family (Lisa Ann Kelly, Chad Kelly, George Kelly, Geoffrey Kelly, and Tristan Kelly), Bonnie Dillard, Josie Castagnola, Jorgia Bordofsky, Sonia Rosenbaum, Kathleen McMahan, Paul A. Rinaldi, L. Paul Cook, Kellam de Forest, Michele Kendrick, Steve Martin, Kelly Cole-Smith, Stephanie Schenker, Angela Whatoff, Kathleen A. McGuire, Sasha Kapernekas, Ariane Schmidt Clausius, Susan Garrett, and Dean Hansell was acknowledged.

Public comment closed at 5:06 p.m.

MOTION: Jordan/Thompson

Continue the Item to the hearing of August 9, 2018.

The motion carried by the following vote:

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

DRAFT

V. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

ACTUAL TIME: 5:25 P.M.

A. Committee and Liaison Reports:

1. Staff Hearing Officer Liaison Report

No report.

2. Other Committee and Liaison Reports

- a. Commissioner Campanella reported on the July 16, 2018 meeting of Architectural Board of Review.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Wiscomb adjourned the meeting at 5:28 p.m.

Submitted by,

Krystal M. Vaughn, Commission Secretary