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I. INITIATION REQUEST AND CONCEPT REVIEW

The City received a request for Initiation of Annexation, General Plan Amendment, and Zoning Map Amendment for the two-acre property at 691 N. Hope Avenue (APN 057-113-007) in Santa Barbara County. The property is located north of Connie Way within the City’s Sphere of Influence and is currently developed with a single-family residence and detached garage. The proposal also includes the subdivision of the property into six lots and a new public road (see Exhibits A and B).

The request before the Planning Commission is the Initiation of Annexation, General Plan Amendment, and Zoning Map Amendment, and Concept Review of the proposed subdivision. If the initiation is granted, the proposed project would return to the Planning Commission at a later date for the following City discretionary approvals:

A. Tentative Subdivision Map to allow the division of one parcel into six lots (SBMC Chapter 27.07); and

Recommendation to City Council of the following actions:

B. Annexation of the property from the unincorporated area of Santa Barbara County to the City;

C. General Plan Amendment to add the property to the City’s General Plan Map with a designation of Low Density Residential, five dwelling units per acre; and

D. Zoning Map Amendment to add the property to the City’s Zoning Map with a designation of RS-7.5/ USS (Residential Single Unit, 7,500 square foot minimum lot size / Upper State Street Overlay).

The discretionary approvals listed above would be contingent upon approval of the annexation by the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO).
II. **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve the Initiation of Annexation, General Plan Amendment, and Zoning Map Amendment for the property 691 N. Hope Avenue. The proposed City General Plan Designation would be Low Density Residential, five dwelling units per acre, and the proposed City Zoning Designation would be RS-7.5/USS (Residential Single Unit, 7,500 square foot minimum lot size/Upper State Street Area Overlay) consistent with adjacent City designations. Staff also recommends that the Planning Commission provide comments on the proposed subdivision design.

III. **BACKGROUND**

The City’s Pre-application Review Team (PRT) reviewed the applicant’s annexation and tentative subdivision map proposal. The proposal included three subdivision options for staff to consider. Staff provided a letter to the applicant dated August 3, 2018, which identified potential issues and additional information which would be required upon submittal of an application following initiation (see Exhibit C). Comments regarding the subdivision options are discussed in Section V.B below.

During the PRT process, Planning staff consulted with Santa Barbara County staff regarding the annexation request. Their preliminary review did not reveal any significant planning or environmental concerns as shown in their email correspondence (see Exhibit D). Consultation with County staff will continue after a formal application is submitted to the City.
Per City administrative procedures, Planning staff also forwarded the proposal to LAFCO for review and comment. No comments were received. The applicant also discussed the proposal with LAFCO.

IV. SITE INFORMATION AND PROJECT STATISTICS

A. SITE INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant:</th>
<th>RRM Design Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property Owner:</td>
<td>Yau Revocable Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel Number:</td>
<td>057-113-007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area:</td>
<td>87,950 square feet (2.02 acres)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County General Plan:</td>
<td>RES 4.6 (Residential, 4.6 units per acre)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Zoning:</td>
<td>8-R-1 (Single Family Residential 8,000 sf minimum lot size)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed City General Plan:</td>
<td>Low Density Residential, 5 units per acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed City Zoning:</td>
<td>RS-7.5/USS (Residential Single Unit, 7,500 sf minimum lot size/ Upper State Street Area Overlay)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Use:</td>
<td>Single Family Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topography:</td>
<td>Approximately 6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adjacent Land Uses
- North – Pemm Place (private road); Single-family Residential
- East – Hope Ave./Single-family Residential/ Monte Vista Elementary School
- South – Single-family Residential
- West – Single-family Residential

B. PROJECT STATISTICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dimensions/ Notes</th>
<th>Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Lot 1</td>
<td>100’ x 141.6’</td>
<td>14,152 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Lot 2</td>
<td>100’ x 92’</td>
<td>9,198 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Lot 3</td>
<td>99.9’ x 92’</td>
<td>9,196 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Lot 4</td>
<td>Varies; with easement and cul-de-sac</td>
<td>9,695 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Lot 5</td>
<td>Varies; with easement and sewer lift station</td>
<td>9,015 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Lot 6</td>
<td>Varies; with cul-de-sac, pedestrian easement, less than the required street frontage</td>
<td>13,736 sf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. INITIATION

A. ANNEXATION

Annexation is a legislative process and current City procedures require that either Planning Commission or City Council initiate an annexation before an applicant can submit a formal annexation application to the City.
At the initiation stage, a preliminary review of the proposal is performed. An in-depth analysis of City policy consistency is not completed until a formal application is submitted. The purpose of an initiation discussion is to determine whether a project generally meets the City’s annexation policies; identify any major or potential environmental concerns/constraints; and identify the potential Zoning and General Plan designations.

City Council Resolution No. 96-118 established procedures for reviewing applications for annexations. The resolution restricts annexations to parcels located within the City’s Sphere of Influence; adjacent to existing City boundaries; and those that are property owner requests, State mandates, or direction from LAFCO.

The subject property is located within the City’s Sphere of Influence, which is established by LAFCO, and is defined as the probable future City boundary and service area. It currently extends along the City’s eastern boundary adjacent to Montecito, moves north and west along the Los Padres National Forest boundary, follows State Highway 154 to the south, and encompasses the community of Hope Ranch.

The proposal meets the criteria for annexation because the property is in the City’s Sphere of Influence, is adjacent to existing City boundaries and the property owner made the request. The applicant reached out to the neighbors to the north along the private Pemm Place; however, those property owners chose not to be included in the annexation request.

The proposal is also consistent with the City’s General Plan. General Plan Land Use Element Policy R4 encourages annexation of land in this area (see italics below) at the earliest opportunity.

R4. **Future Annexations.** Areas of unincorporated land which should be annexed at the earliest opportunity are:

- The Las Positas Valley, extending from U.S. Highway 101 on the north, to Cliff Drive on the south;
- Apple Grove and Golf Acres subdivisions, Earl Warren Showgrounds and unincorporated territory easterly and adjacent to La Cumbre Plaza; and
- *Land generally located between Hope Avenue and La Colina Junior High School south of Foothill Road in the Hope Neighborhood.*

The General Plan Land Use Element also includes Policy R3:

R3. **Annexations.** Annexation of land to the City shall only be allowed if resource capacities exist to serve the additional area and population, the use of resource capacities will not jeopardize priority development (i.e., affordable housing), and the annexation will minimize impacts on service costs.

*Possible Implementation Actions to be Considered*

R3.1  Resource Capacity. It is the City’s preference to merge under one government the city of Santa Barbara and the area within its sphere of influence. However, all proposed annexations shall be assessed for potential impacts on the costs and capacities of resources, for example, on water, wastewater treatment, public safety, and affordable housing.

R3.2  Consistency. New residential subdivisions shall comply with established density and lot area size requirements unless the development includes affordable housing consistent with State Law and General Plan policies.
R3.3 Compatibility. Residential properties that are annexed to the city shall be designated and zoned to be compatible with adjoining residential areas of the city.

Additionally, the City began an Annexation Policy Update in 1994, which included two components: the Draft Las Positas Valley and Northside (LPV&NS) Pre-Annexation Study (February 2000), and the draft update of the General Plan Land Use Element related to City boundaries and annexation. The Annexation Policy Update was not adopted; however, the LPV&NS Pre-Annexation Study is useful when considering annexation of properties in the study area.

The project site is located within Sub-Area 14 (Pueblo South) of the Northside area analyzed in the LPV&NS Pre-Annexation Study (see Exhibit E). The pre-General Plan designation of this area as Residential, five units per acre most closely matches both surrounding City and County General Plan designations. Similarly, and consistent with the pre-General Plan designation, the pre-zoning designation of E-3 (now RS-7.5) most closely matches the existing land uses, current County zoning, and surrounding City zoning. The SD-2 Upper State Street Area Overlay (now USS) applies to all lots bounded by Alamar Avenue, U.S. Highway 101, Foothill Road and State Highway 154, and would include the project site.

Staff’s position is that annexation of the property is appropriate to encourage logical and consistent land use planning, efficient public services, and orderly development in the Northside Area.

B. GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT AND ZONING MAP AMENDMENT

The initiation of a General Plan Amendment and Zoning Map Amendment is also requested. The existing County Comprehensive Plan Designation of the property is RES-4.6 (Residential, 4.6 units per acre) and the existing County Zoning Designation is 8-R-1 (Single Family Residential, 8,000 square foot minimum lot area, 75-foot minimum lot width).

If annexed into the City, the property would be part of the Hope neighborhood. For this neighborhood, the General Plan notes that “The area abuts County properties. Should the developed residential areas ever annex, a General Plan designation of 5 du/ac and E-3 zoning is recommended and is consistent with surrounding properties in the City.”

The proposed City General Plan Designation is Low Density Residential, five dwelling units per acre and the proposed City Zoning Designation is RS-7.5/USS (Residential Single Unit, 7,500 square foot minimum lot size/ Upper State Street Area Overlay) (see Exhibits F and G). This is consistent with the existing pattern of development and the use envisioned for the area in the Draft LPV&NS Pre-Annexation Study and General Plan.

VI. PROPOSED SUBDIVISION

Comments regarding the proposed subdivision design are requested. As stated above, the PRT application included three options for the proposed subdivision. Details of the previous options and staff comments are provided below for reference:

- All options included a separate common lot located in the interior of the development that would serve as a hammerhead turnaround area and include a sewer lift station. Comment: The small common lot does not meet the minimum
lot size requirement. The sewer lift station would likely be a private facility maintained by a homeowners association.

- Option 1: Seven lots; new 22’ wide private road; public pedestrian access easement across the lots. Comment: A private road is not supportable. A public access easement would not be appropriate along the private road.

- Option 2: Six lots; new 20’ wide public road; sidewalk on south side of road; future combined 54’ wide public road also shown. Comment: Staff was not in support of future sidewalk on north side of future public road.

- Option 3: Six lots; new 30-36’ wide public road using a portion of the private Pemm Place to the north; proposed pedestrian access easement across the lots. Comment: Right-of-way dedication rather than access easement would be supportable.

The current design proposal is in response to staff’s comments in the PRT letter. The proposal includes six new lots; a new public road with a 20’ wide street terminating in a cul-de-sac, 4’ wide parkway, and 6’ wide sidewalk on the south side of the street; and a 6’ wide pedestrian connection easement to the public road (Pemm Place) to the west. No residential development is proposed with the subdivision.

For new subdivisions, each lot must comply with the zoning requirement for minimum lot size; however, only the subdivision as a whole must comply with the General Plan designation. The proposed lots would be greater than the RS-7.5/USS minimum requirement of 7,500 square feet per lot. The proposed subdivision would have a density of 3 dwelling units per acre, consistent with the proposed General Plan designation of 5 dwelling units per acre.

Staff suggested that the applicant meet with the neighbors to the north who use Pemm Place, a private road, to discuss their inclusion in the annexation request, with the intent of incorporating the existing private Pemm Place into the new proposed road. According to the applicant, the neighbors were not interested; therefore, the proposed new road does not include the private road but it does anticipate a combined public road in the future.

Fire Department staff commented that the proposed design meets the minimum requirements for a public road and that “No Parking Fire Lane” signs would be required.

Transportation Planning staff commented that the best configuration would anticipate future annexation and dedication of the existing private road (Pemm Place), which means raising the grade of the proposed public road to meet Pemm Place. Initially, there would be no on street parking allowed because the street would be too narrow at 20 feet. The Planning Commission could consider requiring additional parking spaces on site for guests during the time that no parking is allowed on the street. Alternatively, Planning Commission could direct that the proposed road be widened to allow for on-street parking with this subdivision.

In the event that the parcels to the north and the private road (Pemm Place) are annexed into the City in the future, parking could be provided on both sides of the new public road. At that time, a sidewalk could possibly be built along the north line of Pemm Place that would better serve the proposed pedestrian connection easement to the west; however, existing driveway grades and drainage along private Pemm Place would need to be considered.
Proposed lot 6 does not have the required 60 feet of frontage on a public street; therefore, a Street Frontage Modification would be required for that lot. Staff encourages the applicant to restudy the design to comply with the frontage requirement.

Staff is in support of a public pedestrian connection to the public road (Pemm Place) to the west. There is a similar pedestrian connection from the Connie Way cul-de-sac (south of the project site) to Rolling Brook Lane to the west.

In considering subdivision design, staff looks to Santa Barbara Municipal Code, §30.140.120 Location of Lot Lines, which reads as follows:

The following standards shall apply to all newly created lots, subject to the discretion of the Review Authority:

A. Interior lot lines shall generally be perpendicular to the street on straight streets, or radial to the street on curved streets, unless another angle would provide better building orientation for solar exposure or more lot area to the south of the likely building site.

B. Lot lines shall be located within appropriate physical locations such as the top of creek banks, at appropriate topographical changes (top or bottom of slopes etc.) or at locations which clearly separate existing and proposed land uses. Lot lines shall not be configured to maximize development capacity at the cost of illogical lot patterns.

C. Lot lines shall be contiguous with existing zoning boundaries.

If approved, the property would need to connect to the City’s water and sewer system since it is currently served by the Goleta Water District for domestic water and uses a private septic system. Detachment from Santa Barbara County Fire Protection District and other County service areas would also be required.

VII. CONCLUSION AND NEXT STEPS

As stated above, the proposal is consistent with the City’s annexation policies; no major environmental concerns or constraints were identified; and appropriate Zoning and General Plan designations are proposed; therefore, staff believes initiation of the Annexation, General Plan Amendment, and Zoning Map Amendment is appropriate.

After initiation, the applicant may submit a formal application for the Annexation, General Plan Amendment, Zoning Map Amendment, and Tentative Subdivision Map. Upon submittal of a complete application, staff would review the application for policy consistency and perform environmental review. With a complete application and appropriate environmental review, the Planning Commission would hold a public hearing for a decision regarding the subdivision, and would make recommendations to City Council regarding the annexation, General Plan Amendment, and Zoning Map Amendment. If approved by City Council, the City would submit an application to LAFCO for the annexation.

Exhibits:
A. Applicant Letter dated November 9, 2018
B. Proposed Subdivision Design
C. PRT Letter dated August 3, 2018, with subdivision options attached
D. Santa Barbara County Staff Comments dated August 3, 2018
E. Draft Las Positas Valley & Northside Pre-Annexation Study (February 2000), Sub-Area 14 (Pueblo South) excerpt
F. County and City Land Use Designation Maps
G. County and City Zoning Designation Maps
November 9, 2018

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

RE: 691 N. Hope Avenue Annexation and Detachment from Special Districts
APN 057-113-007

Dear Chair Wiscomb,

On behalf of the Yau family, owners of the above referenced property, RRM Design Group is pleased to submit this letter and conceptual subdivision plan for the initiation of the annexation of an approximately 2.0-acre parcel located at 691 N. Hope Avenue from the County of Santa Barbara to the City of Santa Barbara. We look forward to receiving the Planning Commission’s comments on this project and working with the City to improve the site and surrounding neighborhood.

Existing Conditions and Zoning:
The site is an approximately 2.0-acre parcel located at 691 N. Hope Avenue (APN 057-113-007) bordered by Hope Avenue to the east, Pemm Place (a private drive) to the north, residential properties to the south which front Connie Way, and residential properties to the west. Existing on-site development includes a single-family home with access from North Hope Avenue via two separate curb cuts. The site has a generous front yard facing Hope Avenue with a mature oak tree. The southerly curb cut transitions to a yard area, while the northern curb cut connects to a paved driveway that serves the garage. There is a partially-fenced rear yard area for the residence. The remaining portion of the lot is a large, open, rectangular area extending from behind the residence to the west. This area is currently vacant with natural vegetation/grasses, trees along the exterior borders, and a mild slope of less than 10%.
The site is currently in the County’s jurisdiction, although it is within the City’s sphere of influence and bordered by the City boundary on the west, south, and east. This site is designated “urban” per the County’s Comprehensive Plan and is not within any community plan area. Research of the site maps in the County’s Comprehensive Plan show that the site is not within areas of concern for geological issues, scenic highways, environmental resource management issues, recreation, and/or nonmotorized trails. The site is zoned 8-R-1 which allows residential uses developed with 8,000 sf minimum lot sizes, and 75-foot wide lots. Given the Comprehensive Plan designation of 4.6 units/acre, allowable development under the existing County zoning would permit 9.2 units, which is rounded down for a build out estimate of 9 units.

Domestic water service is now provided by the Goleta Water District (GWD). The site does not have sewer service from a public agency, and therefore relies on a private septic system. Per the City water and sewer map shown in Attachment A, the City of Santa Barbara has existing domestic water lines along Hope Avenue, Connie Way, and Pemm Place, and existing sewer lines along Connie Way. Although the subject property and the homes along Pemm Place are technically served by the Goleta Water District, the water conveyance infrastructure is the City’s.

Existing stormwater on site and adjacent Pemm Place surface flows toward a low point in the open area near the rear the property and into an existing drainage inlet located along the southern property line. A large storm drain inlet was observed along the southern property line shown on the site survey. This inlet appears to connect to the stormwater conveyance system at Connie Way. City records show drainage pipe easements to Santa Barbara County Flood Control on either side of 691 N. Hope Avenue, but no drainage easement currently exists on the subject site.

Proposed Project:
The Yau family purchased this property in late 2017 with the intention of pursuing a dry-lot subdivision and, once completed and recorded, plan to pursue the construction of a new home for their family on the new lot nearest Hope Avenue. At this time, the family anticipates selling the remaining newly-created lots to a home builder or individuals wishing to build a custom designed home. No structures are proposed to be included with the annexation and subdivision proposal.

The site is surrounded on the south, west, and east by neighborhoods designated for low-density residential uses with a maximum density of five units per acre in the City’s General Plan and a related zoning designation of RS-7.5/Upper State Street Overlay Zone (USS) under the City’s new zoning ordinance (Title 30). The RS-7.5 zone district allows primarily single-family uses with a minimum lot size of 7,500 sf; however, the 5 du/ac general plan designation would
require a minimum lot size of approximately 8,715 sf. The USS overlay zone is intended to control non-residential floor area and related traffic in the upper State Street area. The proposed project requests the same general plan designation and zone be applied to this property upon annexation.

While the subdivision of this property would be possible under the existing County zoning and general plan designation, due to the proximity of City infrastructure as well as the property’s location adjacent to the City boundaries and within the City’s sphere of influence, the Yau family wishes to annex the property to the City of Santa Barbara and proceed with the subdivision under the City’s municipal code regulations. We anticipate the proposed project will involve the following discretionary approvals from the City of Santa Barbara:

1. Annexation – City Council
2. General Plan Amendment – City Council
3. Rezone – City Council
4. Tentative Tract Map – City Council

A Pre-Application (PRT) was submitted to the City of Santa Barbara, and staff was supportive of the proposed annexation and subdivision. In addition, an initial application for annexation was submitted to LAFCO and is currently pending review.

Subdivision Design and Access Improvements:
Due to the existing Pemm Place private drive to the north and the likelihood that this area will also annex to the City in the future, the proposed new cul-de-sac has been designed so that it may be combined with the adjacent Pemm Place once those properties annex to the City. Combining the new proposed cul-de-sac with Pemm Place will result in a standard-width public road, including two drive lanes and public parallel parking on both sides. Over the past six months, the project team has engaged the homeowners along Pemm Place to discuss the possibility of annexing to the City; however, given the cost to connect to City services and other various circumstances, the homeowners are uninterested in annexing at this time. Thus, the proposed project includes a 20-foot wide public road, new curb and gutter, a 4-foot planter and 6-foot sidewalk, and various other stormwater and infrastructure improvements. The proposed road meets all requirements for fire access, safety, and maneuvering, and this approach is supported by City staff as it results in superior neighborhood planning over the long term as it anticipates and can be coordinated with future improvements in the neighborhood.

The project would result in the creation of six lots meeting the minimum lot size of 8,715 sf per the City General Plan designation. The project would involve associated site work including connections to City utilities and shared sewer lift station. The common areas would be managed and maintained by a homeowners’ association and offers of dedication for ROW purposes will be provided for the new cul-de-sac road, sidewalk, and landscape planters. Other off-site
improvements will be made to the sidewalk and planter areas on Hope Avenue to match those existing to the south.

**Conclusion**

We believe the proposed annexation and subdivision is well-aligned with City’s long-term vision for this neighborhood and consistent with the City’s General Plan goals and policies. We look forward to working closely with the City and neighbors to improve this site and surrounding area. Thank you for your time, consideration, and input on the proposed subdivision and improvements. Should you have any questions regarding this pre-application, please feel free to contact me at your convenience.

**RRM DESIGN GROUP**

Sincerely,

Tony Tomasello, LEED AP
Senior Planner

cc: Jervis Yau
Wenli Yau
Tai Yeh
**PROJECT INFORMATION**

- **ADDRESS:** 691 NORTH HOPE AVENUE
- **APN:** 057-113-007
- **LOT AREA:** 2.0 ACRES
- **EXISTING LAND USE/ZONING:** RESIDENTIAL/B-R-1 (COUNTY JURISDICTION)
- **EXISTING SLOPE:** <10%

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

ANNEXATION, GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT REZONE, AND TENTATIVE TRACT MAP FOR THE SUBDIVISION OF A 2.0 ACRE PARCEL INTO 6 LOTS FOR SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT.

**SCALE:** 1" = 50'

**CUL-DE-SAC OPTION**

691 NORTH HOPE AVENUE SUBDIVISION

EXHIBIT B
Dear Mr. Tomasello:

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. The material submitted included a Master Application; project description letter to staff (6/28/18); owner/agent authorization form; City water and sewer map; title information; copy of recorded parcel map for Pemm Place; and conceptual plans (with three options).

The proposed project consists of the annexation of a 2-acre lot located at 691 N. Hope Avenue in the County of Santa Barbara to the City of Santa Barbara with an associated General Plan Amendment and Zoning Map Amendment, and a Tentative Subdivision Map for a 6- or 7-lot subdivision. The proposed General Plan designation is Low Density Residential, 5 dwelling units per acre and the proposed Zoning is RS-7.5/USS. The existing lot is developed with a single-unit residence, which would be replaced with a new single-unit residence in the future.
II. COMMENTS AND ISSUES

A. Planning Division

1. Staff supportability of Annexation, General Plan Amendment and Zoning Map Amendment. Staff has reviewed the subject application and is able to support the annexation of the subject property because it is located in the City’s Sphere of Influence and adjacent to the City limits and City services. Staff is also supportive of including the Pemm Place private road and the lots fronting the private road in the annexation request.

The project site is included in the Draft Las Positas Valley & Northside Pre-Annexation Study (February, 2000), under Sub-Area 14 (Pueblo South). Although not adopted, the study is useful as a general guideline when considering annexation of properties in the study area.

The existing County Zoning designation is 8-R-1 (Single Family Residential; 8,000 square foot minimum lot area) and the County Comprehensive Plan Designation is Residential, 4.6 units per acre. The Annexation Study recommends a pre-zoning designation of E-3/ SD-2 and a General Plan Designation of Residential, 5 units per acre. Under the City’s New Zoning Ordinance designations, the corresponding zoning designation would now be RS-7.5/USS. The proposal is consistent with these designations; therefore, staff would support the General Plan Amendment and Zoning Map Amendment requests.

2. Staff Supportability of Subdivision. Additional information is needed before staff can determine supportability for the proposed subdivision. The minimum lot size based on the proposed General Plan designation of 5 dwelling units per acre would be 8,712 square feet. All three options proposed for the subdivision include lots that are greater than 8,712 square feet except for the common lots, which do not comply with the minimum lot size and would therefore not be allowed.

As discussed below, a public street rather than a private road is the City’s overall preference for the proposed subdivision. If a private road is proposed, a Public Street Frontage Modification (SBMC §30.140.190) and a Public Street Waiver (SBMC §22.60.300) would be required.

3. Questions from the application letter:

(a) Does the City have plans to annex the properties along Pemm Place? If so, when? No. The City will only initiate annexation in response to property owner(s) request, State mandate, or direction from LAFCO.

(b) What costs would be associated for the property owners along Pemm Place to annex to the City and connect to City water and sewer services given the City’s existing infrastructure? No additional Planning fees (prior to application completeness) are required if additional parcels are added to the annexation request. Each property owner would be required to sign the application. Please see Section G (Water and Wastewater Capacity Charges) below.
(c) Please confirm whether the 40-foot easement for future ROW purposes for Pemm Place exists and the City’s right to exercise the requirement. Please see Section C (Engineering Division) comment #6 below.

(d) Please confirm the invert of the sewer main on Hope Avenue. Please see Section D (Water Resources Division) comment #1 below.

4. **Comments from Santa Barbara County.** Consistent with City annexation review procedures, the proposed project was forwarded to Santa Barbara County for review. Any comments received from them will be forwarded to you upon receipt.

5. **Historic Assessment.** On July 30, 2018, the City’s Urban Historian made the following determination: The 1930 structure does not represent an intact, unique or particular style that is important to the heritage of the City nor forms an integral component of a thematic complex or district and does not qualify as a historic resource. The house has been altered with vinyl windows and is not an excellent example of a style important to the heritage of the City.

6. **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.

If your project involves the elimination of a rental unit, the TDAO may apply. For a complete copy of the TDAO, please refer to Chapter 30.190 of the Municipal Code, or find the TDAO handout on the City’s website at www.santabarbaraca.gov/services/planning/forms/planning.asp.

7. **Inclusionary Housing Ordinance.** The project is subject to the City’s Inclusionary Housing Ordinance (SBMC Chapter 30.160), which implements policies of the Housing Element.

**Subdivisions of Less Than Ten Parcels.** For all Residential Lot Subdivisions where the real property parcels to be approved would result in the eventual development of less than ten Residential Units but more than one Residential Unit, the Applicant shall, at the Applicant's election, either provide that one Residential Unit will be constructed as an owner-occupied Middle Income Household restricted Unit, or pay an in-lieu fee corresponding to five percent of the in-lieu fee specified by Subsection 30.160.070.B, Calculation of In-Lieu Fee, multiplied by the number of Residential Units that might eventually be built as part of the subdivision. The amount of the in-lieu fee is determined at the time of project approval; however, it is currently estimated at $21,757 per unit. At the option of
the Applicant, the Applicant may propose an alternative means of compliance with this Chapter pursuant to Section 30.160.080, Alternative Methods of Compliance.

8. **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](http://www.SantaBarbaraCA.gov/Drought). The City Council may consider implementation of additional regulations, depending on future drought conditions.

B. **Creeks Division**

1. **Storm Water Management Program (SWMP).** This is a Tier 3 SWMP project, since more than 500 sq. ft. of new/replaced impervious area will be proposed. Tier 3 projects 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 site (pre-subdivision). These requirements will be a condition of approval, and the items described below will be required during the development review process. Refer to the City’s *Storm Water BMP Guidance Manual* for more information:


   (a) Include description of proposed storm water BMPs in the scope of work or project description section of the plan cover sheet.

   (b) Include the locations of all BMPs on the site plan and provide a reference to the details on the Civil sheets.

   (c) Include the amount of proposed new impervious area, the amount of proposed replaced impervious area, and the amount of removed impervious area on the plan cover sheet. Make sure to itemize each feature (i.e., provide the sq. ft. of every improvement individually so it is easier to double check the areas on the scaled site plan). For clarification, please refer to definitions below.

   **Proposed New Impervious Area** – area where new impervious area (e.g., hardscape and roof) is proposed where there is existing pervious area (landscaping, permeable pavement, etc.).

   **Proposed Replaced Impervious Area** – area where new impervious area (e.g., hardscape and roof) is proposed where there is currently existing impervious area (e.g., hardscape and roof).

   **Proposed Removed Impervious Area** – area where new pervious area is proposed (landscaping, permeable pavement, etc.) where there is currently existing impervious area (e.g., hardscape and roof).
(d) Include a grading and drainage plan that indicates where storm water from all impervious area for the entire parcel will flow (i.e. clearly show how all hardscape will be treated by proposed BMPs). It is not clear that all hardscape will be treated. It must be demonstrated that no runoff requiring treatment is bypassing the proposed BMPs.

(e) A hydrology/storm water report is required. The hydrology/storm water report items 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 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 calcs. 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 calcs. in the appendices.

- 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.”).

- 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.

(f) 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.

(g) 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.

(h) Before the City Building Inspector will grant Certificate of Occupancy and finalize the building permit, the Building and Safety Division or their contracted QSP service provider must verify that all post-construction storm water BMPs were installed as approved and that they comply with the City’s Tier 3 storm water requirements.

(i) On the plan sheets (typically Civil sheets) reproduce documentation signed by the property owner stating that the proposed storm water BMPs (list individually) will be maintained pursuant to SBMC 22.87.050.

(j) Proposed impervious area is cumulative for two years after certificate of occupancy to prevent “piecemealing” of projects to avoid storm water requirements.

(k) On the grading and drainage plan, add invert elevations and slopes of each pipe for the complete drainage system. Add top of grate elevations to each catch basin.

(l) Where catch basins are being constructed, include the placement of catch basin screens in each of the details and on the plan sheets, per City standard detail Note 19, D-01.0.
(m) If more than 500 sq. ft. of new/replaced impervious area is proposed in the Public right-of-way, Tier 3 requirements are triggered. On the Civil plan sheets identify all proposed work in the Public right-of-way. Also, discuss the scope of work in the Public right-of-way and storm water treatment in the Public right-of-way in the storm water report.

C. Engineering Division

1. The proposed 10’ wide drainage easement shown on submitted plans will need to accommodate three (3) Southern California Edison, Cox, and Frontier joint pole association poles.

2. We recommend having your licensed land surveyor review the legal descriptions in the Preliminary Title Report dated December 20, 2017, including:

   (a) Note regarding “any interest” exception for east and west 30 feet. The east 30 feet could be a Hope Avenue easement.

   (b) Book 370, Page 298 of Deeds dated August 20, 1936. This document indicates “except the east and west 30 feet reserved for road purposes in deeds of record”.

   (c) “Road easement” Book 20, Page 587 of deeds dated May 1, 1888. This document may have created some of the subject parcel and dedicated a road easement.

   (d) Above documents may provide the applicant additional information regarding the approvability of a subdivision. All easements will be required to be shown on the tentative map.

3. Option 1: Private Drive Comments:

   (a) If it is a private drive, no public access easements would be appropriate.

   (b) Clarify that the Hope Avenue parkway will be between the curb and sidewalk.

   (c) There is a potentially significant traffic design conflict between the existing Pemm Place access to/from Hope Avenue and the proposed private street entrance/exit, with the major concern being the exiting from the private street onto Hope Avenue.

   (d) It is likely that the sewer system would be private due to the private road and force main condition until being discharged into a public sewer manhole on Hope Avenue.

   (e) Engineering Division recommends that the project be scaled back or otherwise changed under this option.

4. Option 2: Future Combined Public Road Comments:

   (a) Engineering does not recommend proposing a sidewalk on the north side of Pemm Place based on uncertainty about adequate support from the neighbors and that the grades and conforming conditions will likely not work.
(b) Please note that the aerial map and the existing Pemm Place easement are not properly overlaid, resulting in inaccurate information.

(c) Proposed Lot 4 has an existing drainage course on it and may need to be removed from the project.

(d) This is the recommended option to meet Engineering standards and sound community planning.

5. Option 3: Public Road with On-Street Parking Comments:

(a) Not in support of sidewalk on northerly side as it is on south side of Pemm Place easement.

(b) A public access easement for sidewalk on south side is not appropriate. Right-of-way dedication would be for the entire width, both street and sidewalk.

6. In response to question in application letter: Pemm Place along the subject parcel is a private street/right-of-way easement. It would need to be acquired by the Developer for dedication to City for acceptance after improved (or otherwise secured).

7. The storm drainage system across and near the subject parcel starts from street inlets as far north as Center Avenue. A drainage area and hydrologic study will be required with any DART application. Staff provides the following information:

(a) The storm drain system below the southerly property line of the subject parcel was modified in 1971 as part of the Connie Way subdivision per City public improvement plan C-1-3126. This includes the existing inlet box along the southerly property line (between Lot 4 and 5). There is indication of an easement across 3830 Connie Way for the 30-inch reinforced concrete pipe. It appears to have been designed for a 50-year flow of 70 cfs. For informational purposes only, Connie Way properties were annexed on July 9, 1971 via City Ordinance 3479. Physical markings on the inlet on the north side of Pemm Place indicates the system was constructed in 1959 and called “RMPQ Drainage Channel”. County Flood Control District was consulted with to determine who owns the storm drain system north of Pemm Place. They stated that it is not owned by County Flood Control.

(b) The drainage area and hydrologic study will be completed as part of future reviews but any drainage system across the subject parcel is not likely to be accepted by the City as a storm drain pipe easement. Applicant will need to comply with Santa Barbara Municipal Code Section 14.56 Natural Watercourses and Storm Drain System.

8. Pemm Place is currently 1½-inches asphalt concrete over dirt. City Standards, should the street be proposed to be accepted by the City, is 4-inches asphalt concrete over 6-inches aggregate base.

9. There is a “curb inlet drain” from the west side of Hope Avenue to a small existing
ditch on the south side of the property. This does not meet standards and based upon the scale of this project a condition of approval would likely be added requiring construction of a new City drop inlet and construction of an 18-inch storm drain pipe across Hope Avenue to an existing City drop inlet on the east side of the street. Other solutions may be possible (e.g., regrading local depression to avoid the drainage condition). Future studies will inform the condition.

10. The water main on Pemm Place is a “dead end water main”. See comment below from the Fire Department regarding residential fire hydrant(s); it being public or private will depend on the type of street. Challenges should be anticipated in meeting fire flow requirements. The water main will likely need to be private if the private street option is selected. Consulting with staff from City Water Distribution and Goleta Water District is recommended.

D. Water Resources Division

1. **Invert Elevation:** The invert elevation of the upstream sewer manhole on Hope Avenue at Hope Terrace is believed to be 263.86 feet but future surveys conducted by the developer shall confirm the invert elevation before the final design.

2. **Sewer Extension:** The sewer system fronting on North Hope Avenue would require an extension along Hope Avenue toward Pemm Place that meets all of the City of Santa Barbara’s sewer installation and building standards.

E. Water Distribution Comments

1. Water Distribution staff prefers the public street option.

2. Applicant will be required to construct a new water main in the new public street per City standards (existing 6-inch asbestos concrete pipe does not meet City standards and would need to be replaced) and in accordance with an Agreement for Land Development Improvements between applicant and City.

3. Water services and meter boxes will be installed when the new water main is installed, but water meters will not be set for vacant proposed lots until development is proposed for those lots and building permits have been issued for those improvements.

4. If the street is private, applicant will be required to construct a new private water main in the new private street per City standards. Applicant must install a backflow prevention assembly and check water meter at the point of connection between the City water main on N. Hope Ave and the new private main. Water services and meter boxes will be installed when the new water main is installed, but water meters will not be set for vacant proposed lots until development is proposed for those lots and building permits have been issued for those improvements. Water Distribution staff does not support the creation of a private street and private water main.
F. Water Supply Comments

1. Water and sewer capacity charges will be due at the time of water meter issuance for each lot. Water meters will not be issued until a valid Building Permit has been issued for future development.

2. The water meter currently serving the existing lot is a Goleta Water District meter. After annexation and in coordination with Goleta Water District, this meter will be removed.

3. An application will need to be filed with LAFCO for detachment from the Goleta Water District if LAFCO has not already approved this detachment. If an application for detachment is required, such application would need to be jointly submitted with Goleta Water District and meet all obligations set forth in the Joint Powers Overlap Agreement between the City of Santa Barbara and Goleta Water District.

G. Water and Wastewater Capacity Charges (not including installation fees)

Should any existing residences be annexed to the City (e.g., the homes on the north side of Pemm Place), those homes would be required to be detached from Goleta Water District and would have to pay capacity charges to connect to the City water system. They would need to connect via the new water main built in/along Pemm Place. If the properties also connect to the City’s sewer system, sewer capacity charges will be due. Capacity charges will be based on water meter size. Estimates based on FY 2019 Capacity Charges are provided below.

Water: $8,750 per 5/8” water meter

Sewer: $3,555 per 5/8” water meter

Note each estimate is based on currently adopted charges, is provided as a courtesy, does not include installation fees, and is only an estimate. The estimate is based on preliminary information provided by the applicant regarding the expected number and size of meters needed for the proposed project typically based on the number of dwelling units and/or the proposed metering layout. Actual fees will be finalized at the time of Work Order issuance, will be based on charges adopted at that time, and can be significantly different than the estimate. The estimated charges are non-binding, should be used only as an approximation, and are subject to change.

H. Transportation Division

1. Street Design. Transportation Planning staff’s preference is to include the properties on Pemm Place in the annexation, widen that street and dedicate the street to the City to accommodate the new subdivision. In any scenario without a vehicular connection to Pemm Place to the west, a cul-de-sac will be necessary that accommodates a fire truck. A cul-de-sac could be located near the common parcel with the lift station. If there is no vehicular connection to Pemm Place to the west, staff will also recommend a public pedestrian connection to Pemm Place on the west. If the Pemm Place properties are not included in the annexation, raising the new public street to meet the grade of existing Pemm Place is important to allow for combining the streets at some future date.
2. **Pedestrian Master Plan.** New subdivisions are subject to the guidelines and policies of the Pedestrian Master Plan (http://www.santabarbaraca.gov/gov/depts/pw/transpark/master_plans.asp). Staff would seek public dedication of the street serving the subdivision and for sidewalk corridor improvements along both streets consistent with the Pedestrian Master Plan, including a 6 foot sidewalk and 4 foot parkway along the project frontage on Hope Avenue. For the street serving the subdivision, staff would recommend sidewalk only on the south side of the street.

3. **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

### III. APPLICATIONS REQUIRED

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

1. Initiation of Annexation, General Plan Amendment, and Zoning Map Amendment at Planning Commission;
2. Annexation of the subject lot (and detachment from special districts) located within the unincorporated area of Santa Barbara County to the City of Santa Barbara;
3. Annexation/Reorganization Map coordinated with LAFCO;
4. General Plan Amendment to add the subject property to the City’s General Plan with a land use designation of Low Density Residential (Max. Five Dwelling Units per Acre) (SBMC Chapter 30.235);
5. Zoning Map Amendment upon annexation of the property to the RS-7.5 / USS Zones (SBMC Chapter 30.235);
6. Tentative Subdivision Map to divide one lot into six or seven lots, contingent upon approval of the above actions (SBMC Chapter 27.07); and

Please refer to Section II.A.2 above for additional applications that would be required if the private street option is pursued.

### IV. REQUIRED ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FOR APPLICATION SUBMITTAL

Staff has also 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 with DART submittal.** After initiation, provide an updated application letter addressed to the Planning Commission describing the proposal in detail. If detachment from Santa Barbara County Fire Protection District or
Goleta Water District or any other district will be requested as part of reorganization request to LAFCO, this should be specified in the letter.

2. **Coordination with Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO):**
   
   (a) Continue discussions with LAFCO to determine requirements and fees.
   
   (b) As part of the DART submittal, provide an annexation map and legal description meeting the requirements of LAFCO.
   
   (c) As part of the DART submittal, provide a completed LAFCO questionnaire, which can be found on the LAFCO website.

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

4. **DART Submittal Packet.** Please refer to the Planning Division’s DART Submittal Packet (available on the City website) for a complete list of all submittal requirements.

5. **Plans:**
   
   (a) The submitted plans were not scalable therefore it was difficult to measure and verify square footages. Provide scalable plans in all submittals.
   
   (b) If the road is proposed to be public, the lot areas will be measured from the new right of way line.
   
   (c) Slope: Provide confirmation that the average slope of each proposed lot is less than 10%.

6. **Technical Studies:**
   
   (a) **Biological Resources Report.** A Biological Resources Report, prepared by a City qualified biologist, will be required. The City’s Master Environmental Assessment identifies the project site as having the potential for Coastal Sage Scrub, Coast Live Oak Woodland, Savanna or Forest, Annual Non-Native Grassland to be located on the project site.

   The Report should include an assessment of the biological resources in the area and the project’s effects on those resources. Grading, drainage, and vegetation removal (short-term and long-term), and cumulative impacts should be addressed. Any proposed restoration or mitigation shall be identified.

   (b) **Arborist Report.** Provide an arborist report to analyze the existing oak tree near Hope Avenue and any other significant trees on the project site. The report shall include measures to preserve the oak tree and any other significant trees during construction.

B. **Fire Department**

1. Fire hydrants shall be located within 500 feet of all exterior walls of any proposed structures. The hydrants shall be equipped with one (1) four inch (4”) and one (1) two and a half inch (2 ½”) outlet and flow a minimum of 750 gallons per minute.
2. Access for emergency vehicles shall have a minimum unobstructed width of 20 feet to within 150 feet of all exterior walls of proposed structures. The access shall be constructed with an all-weather surface such as concrete, asphalt pavement or similar material capable of supporting 60,000 pounds. A turnaround is required in accordance with Fire Department standards. All three options submitted meet Fire Department standards. Depending on which option is proposed “Fire Lane No Parking” signs and/or red curbing may be required.

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 DART application being submitted:
Initiation of Annexation, et. al. at Planning Commission Fee..............$3,715.00
Mailing List Service Fee (Per Noticed Hearing)..............................$255.00

Prior to the application being deemed complete:
Annexation Fee (no separate fee for Rezone or GP Amendment) .......$15,645.00
Subdivision Fee (5-10 lots).......................................................$12,920.00
SFDB Fee (Subdivision Grading Review) ......................................$870.00
Environmental Review Fee (DART w/studies)...............................$2,305.00
Mailing List Service Fee (Per Noticed Hearing)..............................$255.00

Following Planning Commission approval:
LDT Recovery Fee .................................................................30% of all Planning Fees
LAFCO Fees..............................................................................See LAFCO
B. **Engineering Division**

*Following Planning Commission approval:*

- Public Improvement Plan Check Fee ..................% of Engineer’s Estimate
- Public Improvement Inspection Fee ..................% of Engineer’s Estimate
- Final Map ..........................................................$7,174.00
- Annexation Buy In Fee ($3,189.00 per unit or TBD) ..................TBD

C. **Water Resources Division**

Fee ..............................................................................................TBD

D. **Transportation Division**

*Following Planning Commission approval:*

Fee ..............................................................................................TBD

E. **Building & Safety Division**

*Following Planning Commission approval:*

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

**VII. Next Steps:**

1. Submit Initiation fee and materials for Planning Commission Initiation hearing.
2. Initiation of Annexation, General Plan Amendment, and Rezone at Planning Commission.
3. Make an appointment with the case planner to submit a DART application at the Planning & Zoning Counter.
4. DART application submitted for completeness review.
5. SFDB Concept Review of proposed subdivision and grading.
6. DART application reviewed for completeness by City staff.
7. Determination of Environmental Review process.
8. Planning Commission hearing to consider recommendations to City Council regarding the annexation of the lot, General Plan Amendment, Zoning Map amendment, environmental findings and approval of the Tentative Subdivision Map.
9. City Council hearing to request annexation of the lot to the City and consider findings for General Plan Amendment and Zoning Map Amendment.
10. Initiate Tax Exchange Agreement between the City and County (timing subject to change).
11. Submit application to LAFCO for annexation and detachment from special districts.
12. LAFCO hearing for consideration of annexation and detachment from special districts.
13. City Council approval of Tax Exchange Agreement between the City and County.
14. SFDB 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. Also, note that you will also be required to post the public notice on the site in accordance to current noticing requirements. It is the*
applicant’s responsibility to monitor that the notice on site remains legible and visible to the public.

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. 4560 ....... Kathleen Kennedy, Associate Planner
Fire Department, 564-5702 ..................... Jim Austin, Fire Inspector III
Engineering Division, 564-5363 ............... Adam Hendel, Principal Civil Engineer
Water Resources Division, 564-5406 .......... Maggi Heinrich, Water Resources Specialist
Transportation Division, 564-5385 .......... Dan Gullett, Supervising Transportation Planner
Building & Safety Division, 564-5485 ....... Eric Swenumson, Plans Examiner

IX. CONCLUSIONS/GENERAL COMMENTS

These comments constitute your PRT review. The project is scheduled for review at a meeting on Tuesday, August 7, 2018 at 4:00 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, August 6, 2018. 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,

Kathleen A. Kennedy, LEED AP
Project Planner

cc: Chad C. Yau and Wenli Y. Yau, Trustees of The Yau Revocable Trust, 3729 Heron Way,
Palo Alto, CA 94303
Subject: FW: Proposed Annexation of 691 N. Hope Ave

From: Evilsizer, Selena [mailto:sevilsizer@co.santa-barbara.ca.us]
Sent: Friday, August 03, 2018 4:00 PM
To: Kathleen Kennedy <KKennedy@SantaBarbaraCA.gov>
Cc: Bell, Allen <abell@co.santa-barbara.ca.us>; Klemann, Daniel <dklemann@co.santa-barbara.ca.us>; Black, Dianne <Dianne@co.santa-barbara.ca.us>
Subject: RE: Proposed Annexation of 691 N. Hope Ave

Hello Kathleen:

I’m responding to your informal request for comments on a possible annexation and subdivision of 691 North Hope Avenue, APN 057-113-007. Planning and Development Department staff completed a preliminary review of the pre-application materials and submits the following informal comments for your consideration. We will circulate the proposal to other County departments when we receive the formal LAFCO application; however, if you need information from another County department at this time, please let us know.

Proposed Annexation and Development
The subject parcel is 2.0 acres in size and contains one single-family residence with associated accessory structures. It is adjacent to the City of Santa Barbara boundary and is within the City’s Sphere of Influence. The parcel is surrounded by single-family residential development to the north, south, east, and west and is across from the Monte Vista Elementary School. The proposed project consists of an annexation to the City of Santa Barbara, with an associated general plan amendment and rezone, and a subdivision to divide the subject parcel (one lot) into seven legal lots. One single-family residence is proposed for each legal lot.

Santa Barbara County Comprehensive Plan
The subject parcel is in unincorporated Santa Barbara County, within the Eastern Goleta Valley Community Plan area. The Comprehensive Plan land use designation is RES-4.6 (4.6 residential units per acre) and the Land Use and Development Code (LUDC) zoning designation is 8-R-1 (minimum lot area of 8,000 square feet [net] and minimum lot width of 75 feet). Additionally, the subject parcel is within the Comprehensive Plan designated Urban Area.

Regional Housing Needs Allocation (RHNA)
The Comprehensive Plan and LUDC allow eight single-family residential units/ lots on the subject parcel. The County Inclusionary Housing Ordinance (County Code Chapter 46A) may allow a density bonus of one additional unit/lot.

Government Code Section 65584.07(d)(1) states, “If an annexation of unincorporated land to a city occurs . . . a portion of the county’s allocation [RHNA] may be transferred to the city.” As a result, the City and County will need to discuss a RHNA transfer at the appropriate time, typically during the tax exchange negotiations required by law as part of the annexation proceedings. It is the County’s practice to seek a 100% transfer of the potential units allowed on the subject parcel under existing County plans and ordinances, which is nine units.

Additional Comments
Our preliminary review did not reveal any significant concerns. It appears that public water and wastewater amenities are available to serve the site and proposed use. The County’s Comprehensive Plan shows that the property is not in a designated high fire hazard area, Environmentally Sensitive Habitat area, critical habitat area, flood hazard overlay, or critical viewshed corridor. We expect that potential issues such as on-site historical or cultural resources will be identified through the environmental review process. However, we have not circulated these pre-application materials to other County departments, who may have additional comments.
Thank you for providing this opportunity to review the pre-application materials and provide preliminary comments.

Selena Evilsizer, AICP
Senior Planner · Long Range Planning Division
County of Santa Barbara · Planning & Development
123 East Anapamu Street · Santa Barbara · CA 93101
(805) 568-3577
sevilsizer@countyofsb.org
http://www.sbcountyplanning.org
**SUB-AREA 14 - Pueblo South**

**Size:** 16.9 Acre

**Description:** The Pueblo South sub-area consists primarily of single family residences, including some relatively recent single family subdivisions. The land slopes gently down from Pueblo Avenue. There are approximately 44 existing residential units in this sub-area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>G. P. Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North:</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Single Family Residential</td>
<td>8-R-1</td>
<td>4.6 units/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South:</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Single Family Residential</td>
<td>E-3/S-D-2</td>
<td>5 units/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East:</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Single Family Residential</td>
<td>E-3/S-D-2</td>
<td>5 units/acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West:</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Single Family Residential</td>
<td>E-3/S-D-2</td>
<td>5 units/acre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Zoning Designation</th>
<th>Number of Potential New Units</th>
<th>Type of Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing County Zoning</td>
<td>8-R-1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>SFR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended City Zoning</td>
<td>E-3/S-D-2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>SFR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Plan</th>
<th>GP/CP Category</th>
<th>Number of Potential New Units</th>
<th>Type of Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing County Comprehensive Plan Designation</td>
<td>Residential: 4.6 units/acre</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>SFR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended City General Plan Designation</td>
<td>Residential: 5 units/acre</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>SFR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sub-Area 14 - Pueblo South

This sub-area is occupied by medium density single family residences. The existing County zoning is 8-R-1 (single family residential, 8,000 s.f. minimum lot size), and the surrounding City zoning is E-3 (single family residential, 7,500 s.f. minimum lot size). The pre-zoning designation of E-3 was chosen because it most closely matched the existing land uses and lot sizes, current County zoning and surrounding City zoning. The pre-General Plan designation of 5 units/acre matches that surrounding City land, and is consistent with the pre-zoning designation. The S-D-2 Outer State Street Overlay applies to all parcels in the north of Highway 101 and west of Las Positas Road.
County and City Land Use Designations

Figure 1: County Land Use Map

Figure 2: City General Plan Map
County and City Zoning Designations

Figure 1: County Zoning Map

Figure 2: City Zoning Map

RS-7.5/USS
(Residential Single Unit, 7,500 sf min. lot size/
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EXHIBIT G