

NZO Meeting with Santa Barbara Board of Realtors

May 5, 2014

City Staff: Bea Gularte, Susan Reardon

SBOAR: Adrienne Schuele., Krista Pleiser., Laurel Abbott, Jim H., Bob Hart., Doug., and others. (*approx.* 12 total)

Questions/comments from SBOAR members:

- Concerned with creating more nonconformancies with zoning amendment process. Need to be aware of unintended consequences.
- How long is process expected to take?
- What is staff looking for in consultant? Expertise in processing the project, or best practices?
- As far as parking, we need to look out for unintended consequences (e.g., a garage that was originally recognized as a 2 car garage in reality only functions as a 1 car garage. By defining as a 1 car garage, now created a nonconformancy and/or devalues property. (Laurel)
- Need to consider allowing conversion of carports to enclosed parking without having to go through a lengthy process. (Laurel)
- Make sure that changes we make to individual sections don't conflict with the sections (ordinances) that we have identified as not amending. (Doug)
- Every house is unique. Allow leniency so people have the ability to use their property as they have historically and allow leniency and more administrative approvals for changes, but make sure that the decision made is clearly documented in all records forever. (Laurel)
- Need to consider parking in driveways. Many people use their driveway for parking, so why not recognize and allow that? (Krista)
- Size of required parking space. Cars are now smaller in size, so the current required minimum dimensions for parking spaces may be able to be reduced. (Laurel)
- What other groups is staff going to? (Doug)
- Why is the committee only members of PC/CC/ and staff, why not larger for such a large effort? (Adrienne)
- They thanked us for including them, wished us luck, and said they will have comments/questions.

NZO Meeting with Citizens Planning Association (CPA)

May 12, 2014

City Staff Present: Bea Gularte, Bettie Weiss

CPA Boardmembers Present: Dave Bernal, Carol Nash, Michael Gray, Pam Brandon, Lee Moldaver, Mary Louise Days, Paul Hernadi, Nancy Borchard (by phone)

Questions/comments from CPA members:

- Members expressed some concerns about:
 - Any changes to the SD-2
 - Staff administrative approvals and giving too much authority to staff
 - Some of the parking changes that have occurred over time, e.g., impacts to neighborhoods by having reduced parking requirements or metered parking.
 - Projects approved with less parking like for a furniture store and then later allowed to covert to higher intensity use.
- Will Zoning Ordinance amendments be processed concurrently with the Local Coastal Plan update?
- Why isn't the City taking on amendments to the other sections of the zoning ordinance identified on the handout as ordinances not included in NZO update?
- Will the zoning amendments incorporate a section addressing court ruling decisions about property rights, buildable lots, and the right of every person to a minimal return on their property?
- What will the consultant do as a part of this process?
- Clarify what staff meant by "other tools" will be used with the Zoning Ordinance.

Members also inquired about the Veronica Meadows project.

NZO Meeting with Neighborhood Advisory Committee

May 14, 2014

City Staff: Bea Gularte, Brenda Beltz

NAC in attendance: Sebastian Aldana, Ed Cavazos, Abbey Fragosa, Naomi Greene, Christy Haynes, Brittany Heaton, Susan Lafond, Theresa Pena, Joe Rution, Ana Soto, Bendy White, Olivia Uribe, Cathy Murillo

Questions/comments from NAC members:

- Give an example of a non-conforming situation (Joe Rution)
- What is a modification? (Naomi Greene)
- When City Council allowed higher densities as part of the general plan (AUD Program), it was so hard to understand, people couldn't tell how it even applied to them. Will the new zoning ordinance be written in layman's terms? (Theresa Pena)
- What about parking? Concerned about parking impacts. (Theresa Pena)
- The General Plan explains the overall vision of the City in layman's terms and the ZO explains the details. (Bendy White)
- Will the NZO re-open a discussion on the General Plan? And will you make sure it's consistent with the General Plan? (Brittany Heaton)
- Will some neighborhoods be more impacted than others by the NZO? (Cathy Murillo)
- This may be an opportunity to encourage more mixed use development and we may see bigger changes in commercial zones rather than residential zones. (Bendy White)

NZO Meeting with American Institute of Architects (AIA)

May 29, 2014

City Staff: Bea Gularte, Danny Kato, Marisela Salinas

In attendance: ~46 people, primarily architects/designers. Two NZO Jt Committee Members (PC Members) and also M. Jordan of PC were all in attendance.

Questions/comments from AIA members: (staff summary comments in parenthesis)

- Is any rezoning occurring in the City?
(Not at this point, but depending on the process, it may be an outcome of any changes recommended)
- There are discrepancies between the uniform building code and the zoning code definitions. As part of the NZO update to definitions, can the City make them the same instead of having them contradict each other which makes it more difficult for projects?
(Good point, we will definitely consider this.)
- What is the correlation between the list of NZO standards being reviewed and the General Plan?
(Many of the standards proposed implement policies/direction of General Plan. AIA member requested some GP policies to be read to the group)
- Groups will come out to delay this process, how will it stay focused?
(Staff and NZO Joint Committee have to work on keeping it focused. For example, we know we want to work on more administrative approvals, updating nonconforming buildings, coordinated project review, etc.)
- Concern expressed about process improvements in the County that ended up more complicated.
- As part of NZO, clarify and increase the types of projects that can be ministerial instead of discretionary.
- 50% parking threshold is an impediment to allowing people to make an addition to their property; they then sell the property and the result is replacement of the small house with a very large house or mansionization.

- Certain groups tend to push their agenda and create more regulations. How will staff handle this?
(Staff understands this and we will push to focus the effort within the scope. We need the AIA's help to keep it focused.)
- What about granny units?
(We are not taking on granny units. During General Plan process it was decided that when review these it will be by individual neighborhood as not all neighborhoods are supportive.)
- Would like information about the consultant selection process? Would like representatives from groups (i.e. AIA) to have input on what to look for in consultant. The consultant will have a lot of say in how the document gets redone so important to get it right.
(\$200,000 budget for consultant, so RFP being sent to firms in California. We have a list of approximately 18 people that have done this in other communities. We are looking, for example, that they have experience with coastal communities)
- Concern with unwritten policies vs. written rules. Can the ordinance give the same rights to all properties in the same zone if they meet the zoning standards? Gave example of a neighborhood with same zone designation where one side has one story units, so two stories not supported (*because not compatible*) but on the other side where more 2 stories are located, no problem getting a large 2 story house).
(Design review is subjective and the design boards/process is discretionary and here to stay)
- What does staff mean by streamlining the zoning ordinance? Do we assure them that more pages won't be added?
(The public should be able to go to one area to find all the standards that apply to them, and that we hope to reduce processing requirements, so that some projects that require PC would only require SHO, that some that require SHO would be administrative and ministerial)
- What is going to happen to overlay zones? Any plans to remove them?
(There are no plans to change the overlay zones. Some public is concerned with any changes to overlay zones, such as SD-2)
- Staff needs to consider historical construction. For example, retaining walls built long ago (e.g. pre 1957) that may not have any recorded building permit and were part of original subdivision tract but not shown on plans. There is a disconnect between what building required at the time and what planning wants now.
(We are working on this)

- Concern with the 50 year criteria that triggers the requirement for a historic structures report. In a few years, all buildings throughout the city built as of 1970 will be historic. Is this really necessary? Should they really be considered historic? Concern also that if over 50 years old, a planning staff person 1st reviews the design to see if appropriate before the design review board gets a chance to review it, when they are the design review body. They were concerned with too much power being held in the hands of historians who prepare the HSRs.
- If a project meets the zoning standards, how can design review reduce the size due to neighborhood compatibility?
- Modifications used to be easy to get, now they are harder to get. Why is City liability an issue?
(It is not a City liability issue. It started with Stanley Drive project, where PC and CC directed Staff to make modifications harder to obtain.)
- Parking Design standards – will they be updated? And when they are updated, will there be input from the public through a public process?
(Yes, Transportation will complete the Parking Design Standards as part of this process and both documents should be consistent. We believe there will be a public process for the Parking Design Standards.)
- How will administrative authority be implemented?
(Staff is thinking we will use the administrative process for fences as a model. Findings will be more exacting, and administrative decisions will not be appealable.)
- How will staff address accessibility improvements? Specifically how can ADA requirement be streamlined to deal with SWMP, like path of travel changes which affect SWMP triggers.
(A few years ago we began allowing ADA improvements without modifications for some things. We hope to make ADA improvements easier to process. We won't be addressing SWMP and ADA as part of NZO but Creeks Division is doing some SWMP review.)
- How to deal with trash enclosures in setbacks.
(Staff will be looking at this.)
- What about variances, how many variances have we seen?
(We do not see variances because the findings are virtually impossible to make.)

- Regarding parking – is it reformatting the ordinance or people wanting to change the parking because people can't park at Trader Joe's?
(The City has many buildings that can't change the use because they can't meet the new parking requirements. We are trying to consolidate as much as possible. There are two groups, for and against reducing parking. It will be an "intense" discussion.)
- What other groups are being approached?
(Listed the groups)
- Happy to see "flexible" and "responsive" coming from City staff on our comment input card.
- Appreciative of staff's attendance at AIA meeting. They invited us to attend any future meeting of the AIA for the NZO effort.

NZO Meeting with Various Land Use Consultants and Others

June 5, 2014

City Staff: Bea Gularte, Danny Kato, Marisela Salinas

In attendance: Trish Allen, Lisa Plowman, Jarrett Gorin, Raymond Appleton, Mark Morando, Steve Amerikaner, Patsy Price, Ginger Andersen

Questions/comments from attendees: (staff summary comments in parenthesis)

- Reduce the process, time, and cost. Over the years, the process has become more complicated and involves more discretionary review. It has increased the cost of development due to process.
- Customers want simplicity and predictability. Return to a way that existed 40 years ago. Need to reduce the number of projects that once they are discretionary they have to go through CEQA.

- We sweat over the small issues.

(We want to try to simplify process, consider where could have SHO review instead of PC, Staff or ministerial instead of SHO.)

(Staff review/authority will be limited. We will try to push for more staff administrative authority, because we can't cover all scenarios with ordinance language.)

- Is design review subject to CEQA? Maybe need a call from OPR that limits CEQA applicability in design review projects.
- Could the appeal process be a check to ministerial approvals?
(Administrative approvals are not appealable.)
- Key to simplification is more discretion on staff's side. Minor projects should be simple.

- What about bathing facilities in accessory buildings? Will they be addressed?

(Allowance of showers in accessory buildings is wrapped up in the definition of a dwelling unit. It is an administrative change not a zoning ordinance change.)

- What about allowing trash areas in setbacks and front yards?

(We are looking at addressing this.)

- Regarding properties with short retaining walls and a 3½ foot fence that were historically built in that manner, are they now illegal?

(They would need a fence exception. Note – they have always been illegal.)

- Who will look at how other jurisdictions have updated their zoning codes?

(Staff is looking for consultants that have experience with other agencies and the Coastal Zone. Long range planning is currently looking at the coastal areas as part of the LCP update.)

- Are you looking at amending coastal area rules?

(Long range planning is currently doing the LCP update. Parking changes would affect the coastal areas. If there is push back, we may change the approach.)

- Concerned that coastal staff will derail the zoning effort. Maybe split off the coastal area. Impacts to coastal area may open it up. Recommend splitting it up to coastal vs. not coastal. Need to look at what happened to the County.
- Disagree in trying to make things black and white. Empower staff to make decisions and make fair decisions. Need staff to be well paid so that they will stay.
- Allow discretion to look at projects case by case.

(Part of this effort is to make the intent of zoning regulations very clear, and to obtain administrative approval authority.)

- Check out the County Code. The table format and hot links in the County Code are good. Even the typeface, footnotes, and links to sections that also apply are good.
- The language needs to be simple, clear, in plain English. Remove all the double negatives. Is there a way to have a legal document in plain English? Images are good. Have the consultants provide examples.

(We hope to do this. We may have interpretive guidelines, and we will have images/graphics in some format.)

- Tables are important.
- Flexibility and some level of black and white matters to make assurances to developers.

- Concerned with SWMP standards for minor paving.
- Be careful with unintended consequences for nonconforming properties. If you demolish and rebuild, what applies?
- Need more flexibility when applying open space standards.
- Deal with change of use in setbacks that trigger modifications.
- What about conforming additions to nonconforming buildings in setbacks?

(Change in policy due to an appeal. Even if conforming addition, it is not allowed if changes the "character" of the nonconforming building. It is on the list as one of the things to change.)

- What about garage change of use in the setback? Maybe ok. Look at habitable vs. nonhabitable.
- Look at the regulations that the public thinks are crazy and do them anyway. Would people then come in and get permits if allowed?
- We are losing industrial uses in the C-M Zone to multifamily residential. Need ordinances in place to help preserve these industrial uses.
- Make changes to the open yard standards to allow improvements to parking.
- Are you going to do everything (referring to the working list)?

(Yes that is our goal.)

- Look at these:
 - 3 foot setback is good.
 - 50% parking triggers in residential, especially single family residential.
 - Parking in driveways.
 - Definition of what is "attached"
 - Square footage of accessory buildings. Allow increase.
- If majority of the public violates a rule, then get rid of the rule.

**NZO Meeting with Downtown Organization
June 10, 2014**

Staff: Bettie Weiss

- Will there be changes in the commercial parking requirement? For example would Alma del Pueblo be required to provide parking?

(I explained that Alma actually has provided parking for commercial uses in the parking garage. There are two areas – one for residents and one for customers. It is in A 20% ZOB. I also explained that we are looking at simplifying the parking requirements so more change of use can occur in various commercial – like how everything in the Downtown is 1/500 allows flexibility and economic opportunity.)

- Is the Coastal Zone included? Will we have different standards for that area?

(I explained that we are doing a City-wide ordinance ZO update and at the same time updating our LUP of the LCP. We do expect to later submit the updated ZO as an LCP amendment and it is likely that the Coastal Commission will want changes –so the result is likely some differences in the Coastal Zone from other parts of the City.)

- Will housing be allowed in the M-1 area?

(We are not proposing to allow new residential in the M-1. Consistent with the General Plan we would like to see that limited area reserved for light industrial and services. The GP identifies areas in the CM zone where housing is appropriate. We will be redrafting – hopefully simplifying – the code to explain how existing residential uses in the M-1 may be improved and reconstructed.)

- Look to clarify the Zone of Benefit Maps so they are easier to read.

(I said we can look at this.)

NZO Meeting with Chamber of Commerce

July 11, 2014

City Staff: Bea Gularte, Danny Kato, Marisela Salinas

Questions/comments from members: (staff summary comments in parenthesis)

- How much is the City going to spend? What are the limits to make sure effort doesn't get out of hand? Are there bench marks to stay on track?

(\$200,000 for consultant services. Proposal will have timeline/milestones. 15% contingency will be built in. Public process may include lots of different input, but will make every effort to keep project on track.)

- Will it need Coastal Commission approval? Will City be approaching the CCC early in this process? Don't want what happened in County after much process and lots of money the Zoning Code halted due to CCC.

(City has a portion in the coastal jurisdiction. We have had preliminary discussions with the CCC. Once NZO adopted the old rules will remain the in the Coastal jurisdiction until CCC approves any zoning amendments.)

- How can you not study FARS if you are studying setbacks?
- How will City eliminate negativity when the zoning inspector comes and jeopardizes a sale because it doesn't meet regulations?

(ZIR process/issues being addressed separately but some standards may be addressed through zoning amendments as part of NZO.)

- How will you speed up the process?

(The amendments to some standards may reduce process time. We hope that administrative decisions can be increased and that we can make standards more realistic to existing conditions. By eliminating the needs for modifications for certain projects will reduce processing time.)

- Are you three doing this? If you are all working on this, who is doing our plan checks?

(Bea is primarily on NZO, but others have other work. A new plan checker will be hired in the future and will have some temporary staffing to help Building and Safety.)

- Why not outsource Planning Plan Check?
(Easier to outsource Building and Safety because operate under a standard code, but financially better to hire as hourly. Planning plan checkers would need to be very familiar with processes and standards applicable to Santa Barbara.)
- When the NZO is adopted, will it be more efficient?
(We hope so!)
- Can you identify which sections will be amended on line (ZO code sections) so people can review existing standards/sections?

(Yes we can do that and as we take on the standards we plan to have supplemental information relevant to sections such as white papers. As business owners suggest you read "Uses Allowed" information on website and see how uses can be improved.)

- What percentage of lands is in the coastal zone?

(note - total guess here! We said not sure, approximately 20% but much of it is residential.)

- Will the RFP be based on only cost and experience?
(Both. Cost alone will not drive the selection but cannot exceed budget. Will look at what expertise they have and suggestions for the project.)
- If can't do all the items on the "list" – have you prioritized the list?

(No priority outlined, but we may handle all the public process to reduce the cost of the program.)

-

NZO Meeting with Allied and League of Womens Voters

June 16, 2014

City Staff: Bea Gularte, Danny Kato, Marisela Salinas

Attendees: Joe Rution, Tony Fisher, Joe Gazzardi, Judy Orias, Cathy McCammon, Paul Hernadi, and 3 others (PC member Michael Jordan also attended)

Questions/comments from participants: (abbreviated staff comments in italics)

- When staff said we hadn't done a comprehensive update of the Zoning Ordinance, you forgot the 1975 rewrite which was done during the downzone. This effort sounds like a rezone not just a clarification. You are taking away the restrictions that the downzoning created.

(Downzoning was done to reduce density. An unintended consequence was setback changes to many areas of the City and that made many homes nonconforming. We are not proposing to change residential densities. Trying to make development process less difficult.)

- Was the 1975 change technically a downzone? The minimum lot sizes were increased and setbacks were increased.

(Many properties were affected. We showed map of areas where zoning was changed. The differences in single family lots are primarily setbacks, lot size and street frontage requirements. We also got slope density that further limited potential densities.)

- The downzone also impacted commercial zones that had residential development.

- Add residential densities to things not to be touched.

- How is changing standards to smaller setbacks not affecting density?

(From planning perspective, we determine density by units. A unit is a unit, except in multi-family development. In single family, regardless of size, it is the same density. In 1975 limited units, not sizes of homes.

- What about boarding homes?

(Can't prevent a house with multiple rooms if have only one kitchen. We have seen them and they are hard to enforce if they have violations and not reported. Tony Fisher discussed lawsuit that rules against City's ability to define a family.)

- In the Mesa, the homes are getting bigger. Some people want more trees. Some people want more views. Need to update the view ordinance to make the mediation binding. Concern with issue of trees growing and blocking and affecting solar panels after panels were installed. Will the City be looking at this?

- There is State Law that if trees grow after solar panels are installed, they must be trimmed.

(We will add to the ongoing list, but not sure we will be taking on views or trees.)

- Be careful with setbacks as they relate to fire access when dealing with fires. Emergency responders need to be able to get through setbacks.
- The Historic Element has been updated. Need to make sure that the General Plan is coordinated and consistent with Historic Preservation.

- The Cottage Industry impacts SF neighborhoods. Judy has neighbors that are running a catering service in their house and garage. Are 2 covered parking spaces required to remain for single family residences?

(Some single family homes no longer require 2 covered parking spaces.)

- Also concern that these home occupations are competing with small businesses in the community. Need to protect existing, established businesses and protect residential neighborhoods.
- If you are going to make things more flexible, modifications have to be really justified.
- Concern with gentrification with large homes. Traffic impacts on the Mesa are horrendous.

- Who are Council reps? (CC - *Cathy Murillo and Bendy White*, PC – *Bruce Bartlett, John Campanella, Sheila Lodge*.) Concern expressed with CC reps being the worst to represent single family neighborhoods. The changes will damage the neighborhoods.

- Who is consultant and how did they get selected?

(Not selected yet. We have a list of consultants and looking primarily in California for ones with experience in other Cities.)

- Will the consultant be the same one being used for **the LCP?**

*(No, consultants doing **the LCP work** aren't qualified to the Zoning Update. We have hired hourly staff and not a typical consulting firm.)*

- How is this Zoning Ordinance and **Coastal** rewrite occurring? How will it be coordinated between the consultants?

(LCP update is currently underway with focus on policies and sea level rise. Any zoning changes will not be in effect in the Coastal Zone until they are adopted by the California Coastal Commission. LCP policies will go first, ahead of NZO. We might end up with two zoning ordinances, one for the City and one for the coastal zone.)

- (Tony Fisher) The **LCP Hazards** Section was going to occur last year but CCC rejected it. The CCC gave the City money to update the LCP. They want the LCP to be a standalone document. The LCP and NZO should be processed side by side so that there are not conflicting standards.

*(The **LCP consultants** are not qualified to do the update to the Zoning Ordinance. We are looking for a consultant that has done this in other cities. Several cities are going or have gone through zoning updates. We could see samples of their work as part of the hiring process.)*

- So we aren't hiring consultant to do policy work, just writers?
(Don't know yet, but their experience may help on how to address the issues.)
- We want it to be understandable. *(That is our goal as well.)*
- Could we end up with two ordinances? *(yes)*
- What is the role of the City Charter in the NZO?

(We will make sure it is consistent but there is very little in the Charter that applies to the Zoning Ordinance.)

- What about Measure E?
(It expired but replaced with Growth Management Program Ordinance)
- What about SD overlay zones? Then why not put SD on the list of things the NZO is not doing?

(We are not planning on changing the SD-1 and SD-2 overlay zones. There may be some tweaks needed for consistency with other amendments we propose but not going into this effort proposing to amend the SD-1 and SD-2 zones. We can't possibly put every single thing we are not touching in the zoning ordinance on the list.)

- The SD-2 was established to address traffic management and congestion.
- Will the City be doing an EIR for this effort?
(The traffic management is more restrictive in Upper State Street. That is a separate effort and part of the Growth Management Program. The General Plan EIR found that there will be cumulative traffic impacts and CC still approved the projected growth. The NZO update is more about the basics and not taking on the traffic management. We don't know what the environmental review will be yet as the changes are not all defined yet.)

- Very little in the Zoning Ordinance about enforcement. Will it be discussed?

(No. The enforcement will not be part of NZO. What is it you want?)

- The process, penalties, options. Identify all the steps for alleged zoning violations in the Zoning Ordinance so people know process and what applies. People process modifications for enforcement cases and it is all mush. State the enforcement process in the Zoning Ordinance. If you are talking about clarifying things, this would be a good thing to clarify.

(We have the Administrative Citations Program in 1.25.)

- The ZIRs include fine print that is not in the code. They are misled about the process. That is why the public counters all give different advice. We should have the same rules for everyone.

- What are outdated uses?

(We are focusing on commercial out of date uses.)

- What about home occupations?

(We will look at the definition.)

- People are not using garages for vehicles and it impacts neighborhoods.
- What about the POD issues? Are they allowed in single family zones?
- What about employees in home occupations?
- Consider the Safety Element in our haste to change things.
- Will you look section of Title 22 that should be in Title 28 instead? What about 27?
- What about Outdoor Lighting Ordinance?

(Not changing Outdoor Lighting Ordinance.)

- Why the Modification? There is unbridled discretion on granting modifications. Why not handled like variances? Make them harder to get and why not limit the granting of Modifications? They should be variances.
- (Tony F.) Modifications came to exist in Charter cities because Zoning and General Plan did not have to be consistent. Variance needed finding of consistency with both Zoning and General Plan. Modifications were created to only be consistent with zoning ordinances. Modifications started in about the late 60s. They are not supposed to be an escape clause for zoning.

The CCC wants the Zoning Ordinance, General Plan and LCP to all be consistent.

- Are we going to change how we deal with conforming lots? Or only nonconforming lots?

(Only nonconforming lots. But not sure we can say we will not still approve modifications for conforming lots. We used to approve more modifications and now we are more restrictive.)

- Then why are you trying to get rid of modifications?

(We still have many requests as rules were designed for rectangular, flat lots. We have corner lots, small lots, etc. so there may still be the need for modification process.)

- The house at the corner has been “under construction” for years. What is the process?

(Can keep permit alive if they have an inspection every six months. The Building Official has the discretion to approve or deny an extension.)

- Appreciated that the City does extensive outreach in our planning efforts as we did during the General Plan Update.

NZO Meeting with Milpas Community Association

June 18, 2014

City Staff: Bea Gularte, Danny Kato, Marisela Salinas

Attendance: Sharon Byrne, business owners and others

Questions/comments from MCA members: (staff comments in italics)

- Will we be notifying each of the property owners of the zoning changes we do? We should notice every property owner.

(We will do the required noticing per State and local requirements. If we specifically change the zone on a property, we would notify property owners. Currently encouraging people we reach out to, to sign up on the website to stay informed.)

- If the City rezones properties so that certain uses are no longer allowed, will the zone change only take effect at time of sale of the property?

(No. Currently it would apply when you change the use or if becomes nonconforming and the uses ceases for over a year. But as a part of this process, the approach may change. We don't envision that this process would make commercial uses along Milpas nonconforming to use, rather the effort is about removing out of date uses and adding new uses.)

- Are you looking to streamline the process?

(Yes, we want to see how we can reduce the process where possible.)

- The Sign Ordinance packet and requirements are very difficult for businesses. It is all very complicated. Will it be simplified?

(Not changing it as part of this effort. SB is the way it is for a reason. City has to balance requirements with visual changes. There are pros and cons.)

- What does 1 per 250 mean? Explain.

- How can a residential unit go to commercial use?

(Gave a brief summary of change of use building code requirements, Growth Management Plan Ordinance square footage, and typically increased parking requirements. It's difficult to change the use for existing residences with no parking.)

- How will our effort help Giffin and Crane and dealing with the unpermitted unit and the difficulties of our process?

- How will our effort help Superica (getting parking next to their building and upgrading the existing building without having to close for 6 months)? Commenter thought Giffin and

Crane and Superica could be test cases for our effort to see if what we are doing in this effort helps them.

- What about 331 N Milpas that is now residential and commercial? What about Italian Deli with housing in the back?

(Every property has a different history. If things were legally permitted and converted they can continue. The process paths depend on the project.)

(We are looking at M-1 and C-M zones to look at perhaps limiting some non-residential uses to preserve industrial/commercial uses.)

- What is going to happen with the concrete plant? *(Nothing)*
- Water run-off - heard the rules are very restrictive. What is SWMP? – Tell us all about it.

(Danny explained non point sources, point sources, and tiers.)

- A participant's building could face Landmark status. Group asked questions like: Does Neighborhood Preservation Ordinance have to do with Landmarks? What is Landmark Status? Does it affect property values? What are benefits? What is process?

(The City values historic preservation. There are two categories of designated historic buildings, a Structure of Merit and a Landmark. The City can landmark a building without the owner's consent, although the City prefers owner consent. It could affect what you do to a building and stricter rules may apply, but there are benefits under the historic building code. While some see as affecting property values, some see it as increasing value by being a Landmark. We will look at possible modifications with findings which help preserve a historic structure. NPO not intending to amend Title 22.22 related to historic structures.)

- Is the City planning on doing timed parking on Alisos Street? Residential areas concerned with commercial parking spilling onto neighboring streets that cross and are close to Milpas Street.

(We aren't aware of any current proposal to do timed parking and those efforts have to be initiated by the neighborhood.)

- Is the City going to look at residential parking?

(We will look at residential parking standards such as sizes and the issue of parking in driveways which is currently not permitted (they were very surprised it's not allowed). We know that parking is very controversial and we will probably take on the issue last.)

- (A woman going to another meeting stopped to ask us why, if City is in a drought, we still allow construction of houses?)