

Chair Maguire announced the ten calendar day appeal period.

IV. CONTINUED ITEM:

ACTUAL TIME: 1:46 P.M.

APPLICATION OF JEFF GORRELL, LENVIK & MINOR ARCHITECTS, AGENT FOR JOHN PRICE, 1298 COAST VILLAGE ROAD, APN 009-230-043, C-1/LIMITED COMMERCIAL, R-2/TWO-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL, AND SD-3/COASTAL OVERLAY ZONES, GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATIONS: GENERAL COMMERCE AND BUFFER (MST2004-00493)(CDP2005-00003)

The applicant is requesting that the City initiate a Change in Zone for the northern portion of the subject property from R-2/SD-3 (Two-Family Residential/Coastal Overlay Zone) to C-1/SD-3 (Limited Commercial/Coastal Overlay Zone). The property is nearly bisected by two zone designations; approximately 7,150 square feet of the 18,196 square-foot lot is currently zoned R-2 (Two-Family Residential) and the remaining 11,046 square feet, along Coast Village Road, is currently zoned C-1 (Limited Commercial). The Applicant's request would result in the entire property being zoned C-1/SD-3. At this time, the discretionary applications required for this project are an Initiation of a Zone Change (SBMC §28.92.015) and Initiation of a Local Coastal Plan Amendment.

The Planning Commission will not be reviewing a specific development project related to the request for a Change in Zone and LCP Amendment. Therefore, no action on a project will be taken at this time, nor will any determination be made regarding environmental review of a proposed project. This item is continued from March 17, 2005.

Ms. Brooke gave a brief overview of the request.

Jeff Gorrell, Lenvik & Minor Architects, and agent for the applicants, informed the PC that he was there to answer any questions that they might have.

The public hearing was opened at 2:04 p.m., and following person spoke in general regarding the project:

Peter Borneman

With no one else wishing to speak, the public hearing was closed at 2:08 p.m.

Commissioners' comments and questions:

1. Is the General Plan designation along Coast Village Road entirely commercial and would the re-zone provide an equal level of protection for setback potential if this property is developed.

2. Asked if we are no longer requiring open space areas and if that would be up to the developer.
3. Asked if once this zoning is approved, would a future development project come back to the Planning Commission, or will it go to the Architectural Board of Review.
4. Asked about the zoning (residential or commercial) surrounding this parcel.
5. Clarified to the public speaker that the zoning laws for our City have allowances for mixed use projects.
6. Asked that, if they initiate the re-zone, there be an environmental document prepared.
7. Feels it is important that the environmental document address the vanishing filling stations in our city the incremental traffic impact of this.
8. Feels staff has done a good job in analyzing this zone change.
9. Feels mixed use is good for this site and expects to see the highest quality of material and design, and that it be sensitive to the neighbors on Olive Mill Road, and consider how traffic would be handled.
10. Asked what would be developable now on this property; what is the status, and how does it currently function.
11. Agrees with the speaker that this is a gateway to Santa Barbara and Montecito, and feels it is a wonderful commercial area.
12. Clarified to the speaker that the Planning Commission is not approving a building on this lot today, which would be subject to future design review. Noted that we are currently in the first steps, and the public will have numerous opportunities to comment on whatever may be proposed on this lot.

The public hearing was re-opened at 2:18 p.m., and following person spoke in opposition of the project:

Leane Murphy

Mr. Vincent addressed the Planning Commission and stated that initiating the discussion in regards to the environmental document is sufficient enough prior to their recommendation to the City Council.

Ms. Hubbell addressed the Planning Commission regarding the possibilities on how this property can be developed.

MOTION: Jostes/Mahan

Assigned Resolution No. 023-05

Move to initiate a zone change on the northern portion of this property from R-2/S-D-3 to C-1/S-D-3, as well as a Local Coastal Plan amendment.

This motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 6 Noes: 0 Abstain: 0 Absent: 1 (White)

Mr. Gorrell addressed the Planning Commission and said he would be very happy to share with the Planning Commission the proposed development on the lot, and does plan to meet with the public as well.

Recessed at 2:22 p.m., and reconvened at 2:45 p.m.

V. NEW ITEMS

ACTUAL TIME: 2:45 P.M.

A. APPLICATION OF THE SANTA BARBARA SHELLFISH COMPANY, LESSEE, AND THE CITY OF SANTA BARBARA, PROPERTY OWNER, 230 STEARNS WHARF, APN 033-120-022, H-C/SD-3: HARBOR COMMERCIAL/COASTAL OVERLAY ZONES, GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: HARBOR COMMERCIAL (MST2004-00309)

The project consists of a proposal for a new 146 square foot outdoor seating area and a new 20 square foot recycling enclosure adjacent to the Santa Barbara Shellfish Company on Stearns Wharf.

The discretionary applications required for this project are:

1. Modification of the parking requirement to allow the development without providing the required parking spaces (SBMC§28.90); and
2. A recommendation to the California Coastal Commission on an Amendment to the Coastal Development Permit for Stearns Wharf for development in the Permit Jurisdiction of the Coastal Zone (SBMC §28.45.009).

The Environmental Analyst has determined that the project is exempt from further environmental review pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines Section 15301, Existing Facilities.

Ms. Kennedy gave a brief presentation of the project.

Scott Riedmen, Waterfront Business Manager, addressed the Planning Commission.

Thomas White, Santa Barbara Shellfish, applicant, addressed the Planning Commission.

Commissioners' comments and questions:

1. Asked what happened to the bench as shown on the exhibit.
2. Very supportive of this proposal and feels the proposal is too modest with sixteen seats and hopes to see more someday.

The public hearing opened at 2:54 p.m., and the following person spoke in favor of the project:

Kevin McCeney

Chair Jostes announced the ten calendar day appeal period.

III. CONCEPT REVIEW:

Commissioner White stepped down at 1:32 P.M.

ACTUAL TIME: 1:32 P.M.

APPLICATION OF JEFF GORRELL, LENVIK & MINOR ARCHITECTS, AGENT FOR JOHN PRICE, 1298 COAST VILLAGE ROAD, APN 009-230-043, C-1/LIMITED COMMERCIAL, R-2/TWO-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL, AND SD-3/COASTAL OVERLAY ZONES. GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATIONS: GENERAL COMMERCE AND BUFFER (MST2004-00493)(CDP2005-00003).

The applicant's request is to develop the approximate 18,196 square foot lot(s) with a 3 story mixed-use building with a subterranean parking garage. The proposal is for 5,000 square feet of commercial space and parking on the first floor, and 8 residential units on the second and third floors. Twenty three parking spaces are included in a subterranean parking garage. The building height is proposed at a maximum of 42.5 feet.

The purpose of this concept review is to allow the Planning Commission to review the proposed project design at a conceptual level and provide the applicant and staff with feedback and direction on the project design proposal.

The Planning Commission will be reviewing the development concept only. Therefore, no action on a project will be taken at this time, nor will any determination be made regarding environmental review of a proposed project.

Case Planner: Steve Foley, Project Planner
Email: sfoley@santabarbaraca.gov

Steve Foley, Project Planner, gave the Staff presentation.

Jeff Gorrell, Lenvik and Minor Architects, representing applicant, gave the presentation.

Public comment was opened at 1:52 P.M.

The following speakers addressed the Commission in support of the project:

Ed Edick, Realtor: welcomes additional parking

The following speakers addressed the Commission with concerns for the project:

John Greer, representing adjoining property : Tree preservation / trash pickup
Danny Copus, Montecito Inn: Mountain view preservation / construction

With no one else wishing to speak, the public comment was closed at 2:07 P.M.

Commissioner's comments and questions:

1. Asked to see map showing the location of olive trees mentioned by Mr. Greer.
2. Asked Mr. Greer about parking lot behind neighboring property and whether or not there was trash access.
3. Asked if density is increased when changing from the R-2 to the C-2 zone.
4. Concerned with the cumulative traffic impact on the region when a filling station is removed, especially given the total loss of gas stations in the region over the last several years. Would like this addressed in an EIR.
5. Asked for clarification regarding residential access to the property and which of these entrances are open to the public.
6. Asked when roundabout construction at Olive Mill Road is expected. Since there is no time-certain for the roundabout, asked if there is a way to tie in the roundabout with the project. Measure D funds are what fund the roundabouts and it is unsure as to whether Measure D funds will be continued.
7. Asked if parking is restricted to commercial/retail tenants or for general public use.
8. Asked if there are any particular aspects in the Municipal Code that the Commissioners should be aware of, such as set backs, etc. that would be needed in making comments to the applicant.
9. The roundabout near Hot Springs Road is targeted to begin in February 2007.
10. Concerned with the loss of the hedge on north side due to the parking garage. The three stories relationship, in close proximity to residential, is a concern.
11. The three story project does not appear to hamper the mountain view.
12. Change of use of gas station provides less traffic and more pedestrian use.
13. Consensus of Commissioners support the mixed use and design of the project as a gateway to Montecito and to Santa Barbara.
14. Likes the development plan as a gateway that encourages pedestrian access. Approves of design, especially the corner.
15. Would like to see interaction with adjoining neighbors.
16. Likes the interior court yard in providing quieter settings for residents of the project.
17. Likes the style of architecture and finds it appropriate for Santa Barbara, but does not agree with concept.
18. Does not agree with providing surface parking within the project. Would like to see all 38 stalls below grade, including parking on the ramp. This would allow for more of an entry plaza at the corner of Coast Village Road and Olive Mill Road.
19. Would like to see what the applicant is giving back in exchange for the setback modification, especially given the significance of this corner to the City.
20. Noted the requirement for parking is 28 spaces, but the proposal shows 38 spaces; asked if this is over parked. This would allow for more of an entry plaza at the corner of Coast Village Road and Olive Mill Road.
21. Commissioners complimented applicant on communicating with neighboring retailers and residents.

22. Would like to see pedestrian access to the property increased and more open, perhaps include plants.
23. Architect complimented on Olive Mill elevation and Andalusian design approach.
24. Concerned with north setback adjoining the residential neighborhood. Would like to see the trees preserved.
25. Floor area ratio for residential appears to be one to one.
26. Consensus of Commissioners are concerned about the height along the west and north elevations adjacent to the residential uses and protecting the trees on the affected property lines, indicated the architecture is appropriate and generally pedestrian-friendly, asked that the parking be pushed under the building as much as possible in order to provide a more significant plaza entry at the corner of Olive Mill and Coast Village Roads.

Mr. Greer replied that the parking lot behind the neighboring property is not owned by his client and does not have any trash access. The only trash access is the one he is trying to preserve.

Ms. Hubbell addressed the zoning questions.

Mr. Gorrell clarified that two entries are open to the public and the third entry is for resident access only.

Ms. Hubbell stated that the roundabout at Olive Mill Road has not been funded and, therefore, could not be tied to the project.

Mr. Gorrell plans on retaining the hedge on the north side.

Mr. Foley and Ms. Hubbell addressed the setback modifications that would be included.

Mr. Gorrell thanked Commission for feedback.

IV. NEW ITEMS

Commissioner White returned to dais at 2:43 P. M.

ACTUAL TIME: 2:43 P.M.

A. APPLICATION OF STEVE BERKUS, AGENT FOR JOHN AND CAROL NAGY, PROPERTY OWNER, 222 AND 224 W. YANONALI STREET, APN 033-033-019 and 033-033-020, R-4, HOTEL-MOTEL-MULTIPLE RESIDENCE ZONE, GENERAL PLAN DESIGNATION: HOTEL AND RESIDENTIAL, SD-3, COASTAL OVERLAY (MST2005-00192)

The project consists of the demolition of thirteen existing residential units and construction of five residential condominiums distributed in four buildings. Eight covered parking stalls are proposed within five garages. A voluntary lot merger is proposed. The discretionary applications required for this project is a Tentative Subdivision Map (TSM) for a one-lot subdivision to create five residential condominium units (SBMC Chapters 27.07 and 27.13); and