



City of Santa Barbara

Planning Division

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

July 26, 2012

I. RECOMMENDATION TO CITY COUNCIL:

ACTUAL TIME: 4:00 P.M.

PROPOSED HISTORIC RESOURCES ELEMENT

The purpose of this hearing was for the Planning Commission to provide a recommendation regarding the proposed Historic Resources Element to the City Council. The draft document is available on-line at:

[www.santabarbaraca.gov/Resident/Major Planning Efforts/Historic Resources Element/](http://www.santabarbaraca.gov/Resident/Major_Planning_Efforts/Historic_Resources_Element/)

A Council authorized HRE Task Force has drafted a new HRE with an introduction, goals, policies and implementation actions for consideration, as well as an appendix. Staff has supported the HRE Task Force drafting process and has reviewed the current draft document, as well as provided a map of historic districts in the document. All of the topics covered by the existing Historic Resources Framework and existing Cultural Resources Section of the existing Conservation Element are covered in the proposed HRE. Additional more detailed goals, policies and implementation items are included in the proposed HRE.

The new HRE is to supersede the Cultural and Historic Resources section of the existing General Plan Conservation Element. The existing HRE Framework was adopted by Council in December 2011, and was reviewed by the Planning Commission starting on April 28th, 2010 and in all subsequent Planning Commission reviews of the General Plan documents.

The City of Santa Barbara invites public comment on the Proposed Historic Resources Element to the email address below or to the Planning Division office at P.O. Box 1990 (630 Garden Street), Santa Barbara, CA 93102. The Plan will be subsequently forwarded to City Council for adoption.

Case Planner: Heather Baker, Project Planner

Email: HBaker@SantaBarbaraCA.gov

Phone: 805-564-5470, ext. 4599

Heather Baker, Project Planner, gave the Staff presentation.

Chair Lodge opened the public hearing at 4:20 P.M.

The following people provided public comment:

1. Lee Moldaver acknowledged the support of Commissioners Larson and Lodge on the HRE Task Force and encouraged support for the HRE.
2. Mickey Flacks, Santa Barbara for All, felt that the document was not clear and commented that the language could be interpreted to stop development of anything. One primary goal of PlanSB is sustainability by having people who work in Santa Barbara live in Santa Barbara. Housing inhabited by people of modest means should not be considered a threat to historic landmarks. Urged that the document be reviewed piece by piece so that it is not prejudiced or discriminatory to people of poor or moderate means, white people, or people of Spanish heritage.
3. Joe Rution, Santa Barbara Conservancy and the Bungalow Haven Neighborhood Association, read a letter from the Santa Barbara Conservancy into the record that supported the HRE as an incredible addition to the General Plan. Stated that to interpret the document as being against affordable housing is incorrect.
4. Mary Louise Days, Pearl Chase Society and Citizens Planning Association, expressed support for the HRE, and stated that the language disputed by Santa Barbara for All is already in the existing General Plan, as adopted by the City Council and that the current HRE simply carries that language forward.
5. Lisa Plowman, Santa Barbara for All, sees the document as being on a collision course with providing affordable housing and preserving historical resources. Suggested looking at densities on a case by case basis. Buffers are not needed to the extent outlined in the HRE since the HLC is already implementing a tough process. Neighborhood policies and identifying neighborhoods as historic is far-reaching and has unintended consequences that have not been thought about. Suggested that instead of a 100' buffer, the wording 'directly adjacent to' be considered.

With no one else wishing to speak, the public hearing was closed at 4:36 P.M.

Commissioner's comments:

1. Commissioner Schwartz was concerned about document wording inconsistencies, and referenced examples. Asked for time to have the language reviewed. Scott Vincent of the City Attorney's Office responded that his assumption is that variations in wording in the HRE were intentional by the HRE Task Force in order to have different meanings for various items in the document.
2. Commissioner Larson affirmed that the intent of the HRE is to protect important historic resources and neighborhood areas for the next 30-50 years, and that the HRE as written does not discriminate against anyone. Strongly felt that density can coexist with preservation. She strongly urged that the PC recommend the document for adoption.
3. Commissioner Thompson acknowledged the effort made by the HRE Task Force and agreed with Commissioner Schwartz's comments on the document language. Felt that the use of "possible actions to be considered" prefacing every implementation plan is weak wording and demotes every action to a suggestion. Commissioner Lodge added that the phrase was included in all elements of the adopted general plan at the direction of the City Council and that the proposed

HRE is simply being consistent with the rest of the general plan in using that phrase.

4. Commissioner Campanella suggested a site visit that showed an example with one resource that qualifies for the suggested 100' buffer and one that qualifies for the 250' as a way to help the development community see how it would be implemented. Noted that the language in HR 2.10 references "parcels" within 100', then later references "developments" within 100'.
5. Chair Lodge acknowledged HRE Task Force members present, including Chair Judy Orias, Vice-Chair Fermina Murray, and Mary Louise Days. She stated that the document had been carefully gone over multiple times by the HRE Task Force and the staff including the City Attorney's Office, and stated that the document is ready for adoption by Council. Mary Louise Days restated the goal of the HRE as insuring respectful and compatible development near historic resources.
6. Commissioner Bartlett was concerned with the protection of landmarks at the expense of being able to build future landmarks. Felt that all periods of our history should be celebrated with each period treated with respect. Questioned use of the word "buffer" and stressed looking at the context in which it is used; suggested "sensitivity zone" as a possible replacement term. Cited page 13 HR2.9 as talking about creating a residential TDR program and felt that the wording should apply to areas that are being designated as a buffer area. Overall, thought that the HRE needs some work in tightening up the language, but is close.
7. Commissioner Schwartz felt that the challenge remained in defining terms such as "compatible" and "respectful", as the HRE moves forward.

MOTION: Larson/Thompson

Assigned Resolution No. 011-12

Recommend the proposed HRE be forwarded to City Council.

This motion carried by the following vote:

Ayes: 4 Noes: 3 (Bartlett, Jordan, Schwartz) Abstain: 0 Absent: 0



City of Santa Barbara California

CITY OF SANTA BARBARA PLANNING COMMISSION

RESOLUTION NO. 011-12 HISTORIC RESOURCES ELEMENT RECOMMENDATION TO CITY COUNCIL JULY 26, 2012

PROPOSED HISTORIC RESOURCES ELEMENT

The purpose of this hearing was for the Planning Commission to provide a recommendation regarding the proposed Historic Resources Element to the City Council.

A Council authorized HRE Task Force has drafted a new HRE with an introduction, goals, policies and implementation actions for consideration, as well as an appendix. Staff has supported the HRE Task Force drafting process and has reviewed the current draft document, as well as provided a map of historic districts in the document. All of the topics covered by the existing Historic Resources Framework and existing Cultural Resources Section of the existing Conservation Element are covered in the proposed HRE. Additional more detailed goals, policies and implementation items are included in the proposed HRE. The new HRE is to supersede the Cultural and Historic Resources section of the existing General Plan Conservation Element. The existing HRE Framework was adopted by Council in December 2011, and was reviewed by the Planning Commission starting on April 28th, 2010 and in all subsequent Planning Commission reviews of the General Plan documents.

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission has held the required public hearing on the above proposal, and the Applicant was present.

WHEREAS, 3 people appeared to speak in favor of the proposal, and 2 people appeared to speak in opposition thereto or with concerns, and the following exhibits were presented for the record:

1. Staff Report with Attachments, July 3, 2012.
2. Correspondence received in support of the proposal:
 - a. Robert Ooley, via email
 - b. Anne Peterson, Trust for Historic Preservation, via email
 - c. Cathie McCammon, via email
 - d. Jarrell Jackman, Trust for Historic Preservation
3. Correspondence received in opposition to the proposal:
 - a. Alex Pujó and Mickey Flacks, Santa Barbara for All, via email

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the City Planning Commission recommended the proposed Historic Resources Element for adoption by the City Council.

This motion was passed and adopted on the 26th day of July, 2012 by the Planning Commission of the City of Santa Barbara, by the following vote:

AYES: 4 NOES: 3 (Bartlett, Jordan, Schwartz) ABSTAIN: 0 ABSENT: 0

I hereby certify that this Resolution correctly reflects the action taken by the city of Santa Barbara Planning Commission at its meeting of the above date.



Julie Rodriguez, Planning Commission Secretary



Date

PLEASE BE ADVISED:

THIS ACTION OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION CAN BE APPEALED TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITHIN TEN (10) CALENDAR DAYS AFTER THE DATE THE ACTION WAS TAKEN BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION.