



City of Santa Barbara

PLANNING COMMISSION

MINUTES

AUGUST 15, 2019

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

COMMISSION MEMBERS:

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

STAFF:

Tava Ostrenger, Assistant City Attorney
Allison DeBusk, Senior Planner
Heidi Reidel, Commission Secretary

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Wiscomb called the meeting to order at 1:03 p.m.

I. ROLL CALL

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

Absent: Commissioner Jay D. Higgins

STAFF PRESENT

Tava Ostrenger, Assistant City Attorney
Allison DeBusk, Senior Planner
Kathleen Kennedy, Project Planner
Chelsey Swanson, Associate Transportation Planner
Heidi Reidel, Commission Secretary

II. PRELIMINARY MATTERS

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

No requests.

B. Announcements and appeals:

No announcements.

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

Public comment opened at 1:04 p.m., and as no one wished to speak, it closed.

The following individuals spoke:

1. Bonnie Donovan
2. Anna Marie Gott (Arturo Gallegos, Chris Barros, Patricia Crissman, Jessie Espinosa, and Jose Espinosa ceded time to Ms. Gott)
3. Scott Wenz

Public comment closed at 1:23 p.m.

III. NEW ITEM

APPLICATION OF EDWARD DEVICINTE, ARCHITECT FOR HANNAH BEACHSIDE LLC, PROPERTY OWNER, 11 ANACAPA STREET, APN 033-112-010, OC/SD-3 ZONE, LOCAL COASTAL PROGRAM LAND USE PLAN DESIGNATION: OCEAN-ORIENTED COMMERCIAL (PLN2017-00009)

The project consists of the renovation and adaptive re-use of an existing 11,201 net square foot multi-tenant commercial building. Specific improvements include, but are not limited to: converting 2,500 net square feet on the ground floor to a restaurant use; converting 1,291 net square feet on the ground floor to a retail use; a new deck for outdoor restaurant seating; accessibility upgrades; a new transformer; a new trash enclosure; a reconfigured parking lot; and new landscaping.

The discretionary applications required for this project are:

1. A Modification to provide fewer than the required number of parking spaces (SBMC §28.92.110); and
2. A Coastal Development Permit (CDP2018-00019) to allow the proposed development in the Appealable Jurisdiction of the City's Coastal Zone (SBMC §28.44.060).

The project requires an environmental finding pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines Section 15183.

Item postponed to September 5, 2019.

IV. NEW ITEM

ACTUAL TIME: 1:23 P.M.

APPLICATION OF TRISH ALLEN, SEPPS, AGENT FOR EDWARD ST. GEORGE, 302 AND 308 W. MONTECITO STREET, APN 037-232-011 & -002, C-G (COMMERCIAL GENERAL) ZONE, GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: COMMERCIAL/MEDIUM HIGH RESIDENTIAL (15-27 DU/AC) (PLN2016-00426)

The project consists of the demolition of an existing four-unit apartment building with 517.5 square feet of commercial space, merger of two lots (APNs 037-232-011 & 037-232-002) for a combined lot area of 18,927 square feet, and construction of a new three-story, 30,830 square foot (net) building containing 32 hotel guestrooms, a 1,674 square foot coffee shop, and a parking garage with 11 surface parking spaces and a parking lift system to accommodate 33

parking spaces. The first level of the building would include the hotel lobby and office, coffee shop with outdoor patio, and parking garage. The second level would include 15 hotel rooms and a 720 square foot hotel lounge. The third level would include 17 hotel rooms and a partially covered patio lounge. A 1,966 square foot deck would be provided on the roof.

The discretionary applications required for this project are:

1. A Development Plan to allow the construction of 20,582.5 square feet of net new nonresidential floor area (SBMC Chapter 30.230); and
2. A Development Plan for a Transfer of Existing Development Rights to transfer 25 hotel rooms from 3714-3744 State Street (APN 053-300-038) to the project site (SBMC Chapter 30.270).

The project requires an environmental finding pursuant to California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines Section 15183.

Kathleen Kennedy, Project Planner, gave the Staff presentation. Chelsey Swanson, Associate Transportation Planner was available to answer questions.

Bob Cunningham, Architectural Board of Review (ABR) Board Member, was available to answer questions.

Trish Allen, Applicant, SEPPS, gave the Applicant presentation, and was joined by Kirk Gradin, Architect, Banyan Architects; Sam Maphis, Landscape Architect, Earthform Design; and Mike Hamilton, Civil Engineer, RRM Design Group.

Public comment opened at 3:28 p.m., and the following individuals spoke:

1. Mary Turley, opposed (Susan Owens, Ed Hammond, and Chris Barros ceded their time to Ms. Turley)
2. Douglas Frank, opposed
3. Natalia Govoni, opposed
4. Susan Mellor, opposed (Paul Bullock ceded time to Ms. Mellor)
5. John Chufar, opposed
6. Bonnie C. Donovan, opposed (Larry Donovan, Brenda Golkin, and Betsy Cramer ceded their time to Ms. Donovan)
7. Christine Neuhauser, opposed (Mary Meredith ceded time to Ms. Neuhauser)
8. Anna Marie Gott, opposed (Patti Ottoboni, Patricia Crissman, Jessie Espinosa, and Arturo Gallegos ceded time to Ms. Gott)
9. Hillary Hauser, Executive Director, Heal the Ocean, opposed, submitted written correspondence.

Written correspondence from Jeremiah Wright, Victoria Valente, Douglas Frank, Lawrence J.E. and Bonnie K. Donovan, Leslie Colasse, Patti Ottoboni, James Wesby, Steve Dowty for The Pearl Chase Society, Ann Hefferman, Linda Wade Williams, Marell Brooks for Citizens Planning Association, Maureen Masson, Anna Marie Gott, Allied Neighborhoods Association, Paulina Conn, and Pamela Boehr was acknowledged.

Public comment closed at 4:21 p.m.

*** THE COMMISSION RECESSED FROM 4:21 TO 4:29 P.M. *****MOTION: Lodge/Jordan**

Deny the project on the basis that the findings cannot be made with the following comments:

1. The Proposed Project is not consistent with the principles of sound community planning because (i) there is a greater need for housing than hotel rooms given that hotel occupancy rates have gone down 2% over the past two years and 5% since 2015, and that there are 18% more hotel rooms proposed and/ or permitted than currently exist in the City; (ii) the project eliminates four existing rental housing units; (iii) the project impacts the livability of three existing units to the north due to potential noise from the parking lift, mechanical room, and laundry room, the shading from the proposed three-story building close to the property line, and the potential noise and activity on the roof deck; and (iv) the large size of the rooms and the configuration of the rooms creates the potential for an unpermitted intensification and change of use, such as student dormitory housing, that would have an adverse effect on the neighborhood.
2. The Proposed Project will have a significant adverse impact on the community's aesthetics and character because (i) the modern style of architecture of the building is not appropriate for or compatible with the neighborhood which is generally comprised of Spanish style architecture or wooden bungalows; and (ii) the large size and three-story height of the building is inconsistent with the other buildings in the neighborhood.
3. The Proposed Project is inconsistent with the General Plan because it does not meet Land Use Element Policy LG12, which seeks to strengthen and enhance design and development review standards to enhance community character, promote affordable housing, and further community sustainability principles, for the following reasons: (i) The Proposed Project would increase the number of hotel rooms in the city through the demolition of existing residential rental units, which is contrary to the City's goal to promote affordable housing, per the City's Housing Element; and (ii) as stated in paragraph 2 of these findings, the design is incompatible with the character of the surrounding neighborhood.
4. The Proposed Project is inconsistent with the General Plan because it does not meet Land Use Element implementation action LG12.2, which specifies that building size, bulk, and scale should be compatible in scale with the surrounding built environment. As set forth in paragraph 2 of these findings, the Proposed Project is incompatible with the surrounding neighborhood due to its design and mass in comparison to existing other structures within the neighborhood.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 5 Noes: 1 (Thompson) Abstain: 0 Absent: 1 (Higgins)

The ten calendar day appeal period was announced.

V. ADMINISTRATIVE AGENDA

ACTUAL TIME: 5:22 P.M.

A. Committee and Liaison Reports:

1. Staff Hearing Officer Liaison Report
No report.
2. Other Committee and Liaison Reports
No reports.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Wiscomb adjourned the meeting at 5:23 p.m.

Submitted by,

Heidi Reidel, Commission Secretary

DRAFT