



City of Santa Barbara

Planning Division

STAFF HEARING OFFICER AND PLANNING COMMISSION *Special Joint Meeting*

May 28, 2014

MINUTES

Staff Hearing Officer:

Susan Reardon, Senior Planner

Planning Commission:

Chair Deborah L. Schwartz
Commissioner Bruce Bartlett
Commissioner Mike Jordan
Commissioner June Pujo

Vice-Chair Addison Thompson
Commissioner John Campanella
Commissioner Sheila Lodge

STAFF PRESENT:

Allison De Busk, Project Planner
Kathleen Goo, Staff Hearing Officer Secretary

I. PRELIMINARY MATTERS:

A. CALL TO ORDER:

Planning Commission Chair, Deborah L. Schwartz, called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

B. ROLL CALL:

All were in attendance.

C. PUBLIC COMMENT: Comments from members of the public pertaining to items not on this agenda. [Due to time constraints, each person is limited to two (2) minutes.]

No public comments were made.

II. CONCEPT REVIEW:

A. APPLICATION OF RICH RIDGEWAY, AGENT FOR 1135 SAN PASCUAL LLC, 1135 SAN PASCUAL STREET, APN 039-201-003, R-3 LIMITED MULTIPLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE ZONE, GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: MEDIUM HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL (MST2013-00377)

The project consists of the construction of a new two-story building containing three 1,294 square foot three-bedroom units, each with an attached one-car garage, on a 11,250 square foot lot located at the southwest corner of West Anapamu and San Pascual Streets. The project site is currently developed with a single-family residence and detached garage. The existing one-story 1,152 square foot two-bedroom residence and 385 square foot garage would remain and are proposed to be rehabilitated, and a 300 square foot bedroom addition is proposed for the residence. Total proposed development includes four three-bedroom condominiums totaling 5,334 square feet and four one-car garages totaling 1,273 square feet. Driveway access to the garages would be on W. Anapamu Street via three curb cuts (one existing and two proposed). The project site is adjacent to Old Mission Creek.

The purpose of the concept review is to allow the Staff Hearing Officer and Planning Commission, and the public, an opportunity to review the proposed project design at a conceptual level and provide the Applicant and Staff with feedback and direction regarding the proposed land use and design. The opinions of the Staff Hearing Officer and 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.**

The discretionary applications required for this project are:

1. A Modification to allow the side yard deck (which is greater than ten inches above grade) to encroach into the required six-foot interior setback (SBMC §28.87.062 and 28.92.026.A); and
2. A Tentative Subdivision Map for a one-lot subdivision to create four (4) residential condominium units (SBMC Chapters 27.07 and 27.13).

Present: Rich Ridgeway, Agent/Co-Owner; Mark De La Garza, Project Biologist; Allison De Busk, Project Planner; Tom Scott, Project Engineer II, and Stacey Wilson, Associate Transportation Planner.

Allison De Busk, Project Planner, gave the Staff presentation and recommendation.

Rich Ridgeway gave the applicant presentation, joined by Mark De La Garza of Watershed Environmental.

The Public Hearing was opened at 9:28 a.m. and, with no one wishing to speak, the Public Hearing was closed.

Chair Schwartz read the statement of intention by the Commission on the proposed project: *“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.”*... And from the end of the Staff Report: *“Please note that this review is not meant to imply any approval of or formal position on the proposed project.”*

As requested by Commissioner Pujo, Mr. De La Garza clarified his professional opinion that staff’s recommendation for a 50-foot buffer from top-of-bank is not necessary given the condition of the creek and further, because the proposed project has been redesigned to replace existing Eucalyptus trees with native trees, install new trees in the restoration area, and protect the integrity of the creek.

Responses to Commission questions:

- 1) Staff clarified the Tier 2 Storm Water Management Program (SWMP) requirements and the proposed permeable pavers for the driveway. Staff stated that based on the building footprints, and as long as the driveways remain permeable, then Tier 2 SWMP conditions are required, not Tier 3.
- 2) Staff clarified the parking requirements for the proposed project. Ms. Wilson stated that transportation staff anticipates a reduction of on-street parking along Anapamu Street due to curb cuts and required sight lines. There would be a parking space gained along San Pascual.
- 3) Staff clarified potential privacy impacts associated with the new units and the proposed deck. Staff clarified that the fence will be removed and replaced, with efforts to minimize all other privacy impacts.
- 4) Mr. Scott clarified the standard street lighting requirements regarding fixtures, location, downward-directed lighting, and removal of the existing cobra head street light fixtures from the existing Edison poles and installation of new free-standing light poles with domus fixtures. The standards will shield the light from the creek.
- 5) Commissioner Campanella requested clarification on the method of egress relative to the existing westerly traffic pattern. Ms. Wilson stated that Derrick Bailey, Supervising Transportation Engineer, determined that the existing traffic patterns surrounding the project allow adequate entrance and egress for the proposed project.
- 6) Staff clarified that the creek restoration area counts toward the open living space requirements.
- 7) Staff stated that this project would not result in a large increase in traffic volume and that additional stop signs/lights were not necessary in the proximity of the proposed project. There would be some red curb at the intersection and at the driveways.
- 8) Staff clarified that there is a difference between the Actual Top of Creek Bank and the Calculated Top of Creek Bank. Staff uses whichever is more restrictive; for the proposed project, it’s the Actual Top of Bank.

Comments by the Planning Commission and Staff Hearing Officer:

- 1) Commissioner Pujo appreciates the restoration plan and has no issues with the proposed creek setback or the analysis in the Biological Report. She found the removal and replacement of the existing Eucalyptus trees to be

appropriate for the long-term health of the creek. She requested that professional restoration monitoring and assessment of success be part of the restoration plan. She does not think the setback buffer needs to be all restoration area; there should be some useable open space too. Planned street improvements for poles and lighting standards may have an aesthetic impact and that should be considered by the ABR; pedestrian scale lighting is important but the clutter of poles should also be considered.

- 2) Commission Thompson stated that the site has many constraints and he finds the proposed design to be an excellent solution. Encapsulating the soil benefits the neighborhood due to reduced construction impacts. The proposed creek setback is more than adequate for Old Mission Creek, which has been relegated to little more than a drainage culvert following the diversion of Mission Creek many years ago. His main concern was cars backing out onto Anapamu Street, but he is not as concerned after the site visit because it should not greatly affect traffic flow in the area. Either retention or replacement of the Eucalyptus trees is not an issue for him, as they can provide habitat too.
- 3) Commissioner Lodge concurred with Commissioner Thompson's comments, except for the eucalyptus trees, which she thinks should be removed and replaced with oaks and sycamores. This is a perfect example of infill development. She supports the deck modification if direct access to it from the units can be provided.
- 4) Commissioner Jordan commented that it's not appropriate to use one General Plan policy to support increased density but ignore policies for creek protection. Disagrees with the argument about matching the creek setback to adjacent development; we should be improving the current situation. He can accept the creek setbacks proposed given the site-specific conditions, but thinks the project should be complying with Tier 3 SWMP since the site is mostly dirt and pervious now. He is concerned with the common open yard area which should be maximized; suggested fencing the creek, but with access, to maximize both useable common open space and creek restoration area. Consistency with General Plan policies is a required finding for condominium development, so there is a higher level of scrutiny.
- 5) Commissioner Bartlett likes the design concept and how it addresses site constraints. Finds the 50-foot recommended creek setback to be excessive for what no longer acts as a creek. Doesn't agree that this needs to be a Tier 3 project, and, given the soil contamination, increased percolation may actually be worse for the creek. The proposed creek setback is more than 50 feet from the water and is more than adequate. The interior setback modification for the deck does not seem necessary since the only access to it is from the garages. May be able to support if there was better access to it from the living areas. Vehicles backing into the street were a concern, but planned efforts to mitigate the issue are acceptable per Transportation Division staff's input. Was concerned about loss of on-street parking, but finds it acceptable because there will be spaces gained along San Pascual. Does not agree with the required street lighting; off-site mitigation at the Boys & Girls Club frontage is a great alternative for the street lighting issue. It's a good project, but he cannot support the deck modification request as

- currently proposed. Suggested that the creek monitoring report could be included as part of the AUD Adaptive Management Program.
- 6) Commissioner Campanella found the 25-foot creek setback acceptable due to the current condition of the creek and the large setback from the water. This is a nice design with more breathing room due to having two front setbacks. Three bedroom units are desired and they will be more moderately priced in this neighborhood. He is okay with the interior setback modification for the deck. Suggested the applicant consider providing a hammerhead turnaround in lieu of the porches, but understands it could negatively impact the aesthetics of the design. He would like staff to consider a four-way stop at the San Pascual/W. Anapamu Street intersection. Suggested staff speak to the Boys Club to hear their thoughts relative to pedestrian, bicycle and vehicle traffic improvements they would like to see.
 - 7) Chair Schwartz supports the proposed 25-foot creek setback; thinks the project will greatly improve the neighborhood and the creek. Not sure if there's a benefit to having a physical separation between undisturbed habitat and more useable open space, as suggested by Commissioner Jordan. Defers to the experts about these specific Eucalyptus trees; we want to maintain a visual screen to/for the adjacent apartments; the Urban Forest Management Plan should also be considered. Safe egress from the site may be an issue with the adjacent Boys & Girls Club facility due to the number of children present; perhaps signage would help; the loss of street parking spaces is not an issue; requested more red curb painting be incorporated along W. Anapamu Street; the deck modification request should be reassessed as there's no strong nexus currently; stated the permeable paving and water runoff contamination assessment is important to protect the public health.
 - 8) Staff Hearing Officer Reardon echoed the comments regarding the interface between the creek restoration area and the open space area, and how that will work.

I. ADJOURNMENT

Planning Commission Chair Schwartz adjourned the meeting at 10:40 a.m.

Submitted by,



Kathleen God, Staff Hearing Officer Secretary