



# MEETING MINUTES

CITY OF SANTA BARBARA

## Joint Meeting of the Transportation & Circulation Committee and the Planning Commission

David Gebhard Public Meeting Room  
630 Garden Street, Santa Barbara, CA  
Thursday, April 28, 2005  
6:00 PM

---

CALL TO ORDER: TCC Chair Coffman-Grey called the meeting to order at 6:15 PM.

### ROLL CALL:

#### TCC MEMBERS

William C. Boyd  
Keith Coffman-Grey (Chair)  
Michael Cooper  
Isabelle Greene  
Barry Siegel (Vice-Chair)

#### Attendance

Present  
Present  
Present  
Excused  
Present

#### CITY STAFF PRESENT :

Browning Allen, Transportation Manager  
Robert J. Dayton, Supervising Transportation Planner  
Billie Goodnick, Landscape Architect  
Liz Limon, Project Planner  
John Ledbetter, Principal Planner  
Anne Van Belkom, Senior Office Specialist

#### PC MEMBERS

Charmaine Curtis Jacobs  
John Jostes  
Stella Larson  
William T. Mahan  
Jonathan Maguire (Chair)  
George C. Myers  
Harwood A. White, Jr.

Present  
Excused  
Excused  
Present  
Present  
Present  
Present

### CHANGES TO THE AGENDA:

The TCC and PC agreed to Browning Allen's request to have Agenda Item No. 4 (General Plan Update) presented prior to Agenda Item No. 3 (Pedestrian Master Plan).

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

1. None.

**REPORTS:**

2. General Plan Update Transportation & Circulation Issues – Liz Limon.

John Ledbetter, Principal Planner, explained that the purpose of his presentation was to give the TCC and PC an opportunity to jointly review and discuss the trends and issues identified in the report in order for the TCC and PC to confirm that the identification of these trends and issues are accurate and complete. Mr. Ledbetter related that while the Housing Element is reviewed every five to seven years, the General Plan is reviewed every 15-20 years. The Housing Element was last reviewed in its original form in 1964, with an update made to the Land Use section in 1989. Since Measure E will sunset in 2010, the focus at this time is on the next increments of growth in both the commercial and residential sectors.

Mr. Ledbetter then gave an overview of the timeline for updating the General Plan which includes four phases : Phase 1 (2004-2005) will focus on the completion of all reports; Phase II (2005-2006) will focus on public outreach; Phase III (2007-2008) will entail the development of test scenarios for future growth options and the selection of a preferred option, and Phase IV (2008-2009) will the completion of a Charter Amendments, General Plan Elements, and appropriate changes to the Zoning Ordinance. In response to questions regarding the scope of this project, and Dr. Cooper's concern that this item should be revisited (as the magnitude of the project was overwhelming), Mr. Ledbetter clarified that the intent at this meeting was for the TCC and PC to only look at the big picture items that may not already have been identified. The purpose of this meeting was not to resolve the big picture items or to discuss them in detail. However, for those who need additional time for comments, Mr. Ledbetter would welcome additional written comments after the meeting in order to give those TCC and PC members who needed additional time an additional opportunity to comment. Planning Commission Chair Maguire also informed the group that there would be a wrap up of trends and issues at the June 23, 2005, Planning Commission meeting and that the TCC members were invited to attend. Mr. Ledbetter stated that he would notify TCC members of that meeting.

Liz Limon, Project Planner, reiterated again that the intent of the meeting was to focus on the major trends and issues to ensure that they reference current thinking on alternative modes of travel, and that all of the current major trends and issues are identified and included. Ms. Limon listed categories such as existing plans and policies, regional trends, regional issues, housing market variation and regional consensus on growth as items already identified. She also gave specific examples under each of those categories.

Following her presentation, Ms. Limon stated that she was hoping for feedback at the meeting, she would accept written comments during the week following the meeting.

Below is a brief summary of TCC and PC comments.

TCC Member Siegel thought that the overall document was good, but that the report did not include an action plan (such as for the next five years) and felt that the City could develop

recommendations that would lead to an action plan.

TCC Member Boyd asked to be able to look at the transportation data from the ATE study, and also felt that additional transportation data was needed. TCC Member Cooper also asked who was reviewing the transportation data to determine whether or not it was accurate. Ms. Limon responded that the data they had currently was only abbreviated preliminary data, and that they would need further data that was up to date when talking about future growth. TCC Member Boyd wanted to make sure that the group is able to review any such data early in order to determine what may be missing and will be needed in addition. Regarding transportation, TCC Member Boyd noted that in the report, there is no mention of freight transportation in either the downtown or peripheral areas. Mr. Ledbetter responded that he was aware of the need to establish the specific type of data sets that would be needed to establish growth scenarios. Once this is done, this would go before the TCC for review. In response to Mr. Boyd, Mr. Ledbetter stated that there would be modeling done, and the results of the modeling will also be reviewed by the TCC.

(Planning Commissioner Curtis Jacobs came in at 6:50 PM.)

Planning Commissioner Myers suggested that growth scenarios for un-annexed areas (such as "Noleta") be included in order to determine what might happen if this area becomes a part of the City of Santa Barbara instead of the County of Santa Barbara.

Planning Commission Chair Maguire asked to also include a section on the job/housing imbalance due to the high cost of living. He also felt that a missing trend was intractability in getting all projects done since it seems the easier and less costly projects get done, but the more expensive and more difficult projects get continually postponed to the point where they never get completed. Mr. Maguire felt that additional growth should be encouraged within the downtown area and discouraged within residential areas. He would consider giving additional mitigation points for projects being built within the downtown area.

Planning Commissioner Curtis Jacobs asked about the role that CEQA plays in terms of requirements for traffic.

Citing Cottage Hospital's contribution of funds to employees using alternative transportation, TCC Member Boyd asked for staff to look for additional opportunities to use those types of strategies to get more people out of cars.

TCC Vice-Chair Siegel asked for further review of the Las Positas/Mission corridor.

Public Comment:

Grant House, Council candidate, emphasized the need for public outreach, inclusion, and education, in order that the correct conclusion is reached by the public which then would expedite obtaining public consensus.

3. Pedestrian Master Plan – Rob Dayton

Mr. Dayton, Supervising Transportation Planner, reminded the TCC and PC that they have already reviewed this document twice. Mr. Dayton further related that this document was set up

so that the three sections relating to Safe Routes to School, the Pedestrian Design Guide, and the Paseo System, would each be able to stand separately as its own document. The only item still not complete as part of the Pedestrian Master Plan is the Financial Constraint Plan. However, Mr. Dayton assured the TCC/PC that if they were to endorse the document, it would still come to them for review at a later date with all of the missing items included. The goal of tonight's meeting was to receive further comments regarding this document and a recommendation for approval.

Planning Commissioner Maguire asked what would happen if additional comments were received after the meeting. Mr. Dayton responded that request for additional changes would be approved as long as they do not affect the tone of the policy.

TCC/PC members gave their comments regarding the Pedestrian Master Plan and asked that their comments be combined into an Excel spreadsheet. Staff agreed to combine all of the comments into a matrix which will be presented to the TCC/PC a future date.

The PC and TCC members made separate motions following their comments and discussion.

MOTION 1: Made by Maguire and seconded by White.

The Planning Commission recommends that Council adopt the Pedestrian Master Plan, and direct staff to determine what policy changes and zoning amendment changes should be developed (based on the information in Table X-2 of the Pedestrian Master Plan) and prepare a work plan designed to accomplish these policy and zoning amendment changes.

Ayes: 5      Noes: 0      Abstains: 0      Absent: 0 (Jostes, Larson)

MOTION 2: Made by Boyd and seconded by Siegel.

The Transportation & Circulation Committee recommends that Council adopt the Pedestrian Master Plan (as modified to reflect the comments from the Joint TCC/PC meeting on April 26, 2005) and that they direct staff to prepare a work plan designed to identify and bring about the required policy and zoning amendment changes (based on the information in Table X-2 of the Pedestrian Master Plan).

Ayes: 4      Noes: 0      Abstains: 0      Absent: 1 (Greene)

Following the two motions, Mr. Dayton reiterated that he would provide a matrix of all of the comments made at this meeting, as was done previously. This matrix will be presented to the PC/TCC at a future date.

#### 4. Staff Briefing

At the end of the meeting, Browning Allen reminded everyone that there were two vacant positions on the TCC. The deadline for submission of applications was on May 23, 2005.

ADJOURNMENT: 9:15 PM