



# CITY OF SANTA BARBARA

## COUNCIL AGENDA REPORT

**AGENDA DATE:** October 2, 2012

**TO:** Mayor and Councilmembers

**FROM:** Planning Division, Community Development Department

**SUBJECT:** Proposed Historic Resources Element

### **RECOMMENDATION:**

That Council adopt, by reading of title only, A Resolution of the Council of the City of Santa Barbara Adopting the Historic Resources Element.

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:**

A new version of a Historic Resources Element (HRE), drafted by a Council-authorized Task Force, is proposed for adoption. The proposed HRE would replace the existing General Plan HRE Framework and the "Cultural and Historic Resources" section of the existing Environmental Resources Element. The HRE proposed policies are similar to the policies to be replaced. Additional and more detailed goals, policies and implementation items are included in the proposed HRE, which generally give direction for and clarify existing city historic preservation practices.

Both the Historic Landmarks Commission (HLC) and Planning Commission (PC) recommend the HRE to the Council for adoption. Staff has carefully reviewed the document with the HRE Task Force and has no further comment on the document other than responses to a 9/5/12 letter from the Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History (SBMNH), Attachment 2. Public commenters have been supportive of the document, with the exception of the "Santa Barbara for All" organization, which is concerned that historic preservation may affect the ability to build densities to support affordable housing. Staff has found that the proposed HRE goals and policies for historic preservation are consistent with the General Plan as a whole, including policies encouraging housing production, and recommends that Council adopt the HRE.

### **DISCUSSION:**

The proposed Historic Resources Element (HRE) is to replace these sections of the 2011 Santa Barbara General Plan:

- 2011 Historic Resources Element Framework (HRE Framework) entire chapter, pages 1 - 6

- “Cultural and Historic Resources” sections in pages 26 through 30 and pages 66 through 68 of the Environmental Resources Element (shown in the General Plan document as a reproduction of the 1979 Conservation Element)

The HRE proposed policies are similar to the policies to be replaced. All of the topics covered by the existing Historic Resources Framework and existing Cultural Resources Section of the existing Conservation Element portion of the Environmental Resources Element are covered in the proposed Historic Resources Element. Policy topics such as the following appear in either or both the existing General Plan HRE or Conservation Element as well as the proposed HRE:

- Protection of historic and archaeological resources through appropriate regulatory tools such as buffers, transfer of development rights, reduced densities near resources, adaptive reuse, design districts, and designations
- Protection of historic and archaeological resources through ensuring compatible development through review processes
- Protection of historic resources through adaptive reuse of historic resources
- Promoting public awareness of historic and archaeological resources
- Surveying and documenting historic resources in the community
- Ensuring governmental coordination, uniformity in regulations, and effectiveness in addressing and protecting historic and archaeological resources

A detailed comparison chart showing all policies was presented to the HLC and PC in a Staff Report.

Additional more detailed goals, policies and implementation items are included in the proposed HRE. The intent of the new items is the same as it was for the existing documents, and the result of the new items may be better protection of historic resources in some cases. New topics include the following:

**Two new goals** elevate topics of governmental effectiveness (“Governmental Cooperation”) and the importance of historic resources preservation in neighborhoods (“Neighborhood Historic Preservation”).

**New policies** expand on the importance of:

- avoiding demolition of historic resources
- protection of neighborhood historic resources
- streetscape and landscape historic resources
- surveying, documenting and designating resources

### **Reviews:**

**Historic Resources Element Task Force.** On June 28, 2011, Council authorized a Historic Resources Element (HRE) Task Force to draft a new Historic Resources Element. The HRE Task Force voting membership is two Historic Landmarks

Commissioners and one Planning Commissioner. Representatives from various other community groups are included in the HRE Task Force and contributed to discussion and work on the HRE (Attachment 1, HRE Task Force Participants). The HRE Task Force met 22 times since July 2011 and drafted an introduction, goals, policies and implementation actions for consideration, as well as an appendix. Staff supported the HRE Task Force drafting process and provided a map of historic districts. Staff has carefully reviewed the document with the HRE Task Force and has no further comment on the document other than responses listed below, to 9/15/12 correspondence from the SBMNH, Attachment 2.

**Santa Barbra Museum of Natural History (SBMNH) California Indian Advisory Committee.** In May 2012, Staff met with and provided the draft HRE to the SBMNH California Indian Advisory Committee. The Committee requested additional time to review the document. Per the Committee's request, the HLC and PC hearings were delayed by approximately one month. Comments received from the SBMNH on 9/5/12, Attachment 2, recommend changes to items HR1.5 and HR9.5. Staff supports the changes suggested for HR1.5 regarding clarifying that parties listed on the City's "Archaeological Monitors List" should be considered for notification as part of the environmental review process. Staff also is supportive of an amendment to the end of HR9.5.c to insert the text ", in addition to those of the SBMNH", as the intent of the item was not to overlook the existing functions of the SBMNH. Staff has included language in the proposed Council Resolution to revise the HRE to include these points.

**Historic Landmarks Commission (HLC).** The July 18, 2012 HLC minutes, Attachment 3, detail that the HLC unanimously supported the adoption of the HRE. The HLC also directed the HRE Task Force to incorporate the term "cultural landscapes" into the document, as recommended for use by the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Preservation. The HRE Task Force met to incorporate this term into the document as the HLC directed.

**Planning Commission (PC).** On July 26, 2012, the PC discussed a number of topics related to: historic buffers and potential effects on housing, resource mapping, transfer of development right applicability and the HRE Task Force's specific proposed wording choices. The PC voted 4 to 3 to recommend the element for adoption by Council, Resolution 011-12, Attachment 4. The following is a synopsis of the discussion prior to their adoption of the resolution.

**Buffers.** The buffer language is in the approved 2011 General Plan and the wording has not been changed by the HRE Task Force at staff's recommendation, with one exception. At their last meeting, the HRE Task Force chose to generalize the statement regarding the applicability of HRE 2.10.a and removed the phrase ", or consideration of increased densities for rental, employer and/or affordable housing", to avoid any confusion regarding how historic preservation buffers would apply to all projects. A definition of buffer has been included in the proposed glossary for the HRE. The proposed buffer definition helps to clarify that a buffer is a way to ensure compatibility through a number of potential ways.

Two levels of buffer distance analysis are included in the current General Plan. For both buffer distances staff is implementing “tags” within the City’s Tidemark Advantage system for parcels within the prescribed buffer distances. This way, as soon as potential applicants interface with the Planning Division, they will be notified that there is a nearby historic resource. In this way, consideration of nearby historic resources will occur early in the planning process.

- a. **100’ Buffer.** Tagging or “flagging” parcels within 100’ of a historic resource will indicate a higher likelihood for the need for either a historic resources report or additional considerations for protection of a resource.
- b. **250’ Buffer.** Parcels within 250’ of Presidio area historic resources would also be similarly tagged. A greater buffer distance for this area is in place due to these resources being a very high preservation priority and the special vulnerability of adobe structures.

**Reduce Densities.** HR2.8 specifies potential reduced densities where appropriate within 100’ of a historic resource. This item exists within the 2011 General Plan, and at staff’s recommendation, the language of this item has not been altered by the HRE Task Force. The language is consistent with the General Plan map densities near El Pueblo Viejo District Part I downtown historic resources. As with the buffers, this item calls for case by case analysis of each development proposal, and even calls out that higher densities for housing would be allowable where appropriate. Both housing and historic preservation goals can be achieved throughout the city, and each item has been carefully crafted to ensure both goals can be implemented.

**Historic Resources Map.** Some Planning Commissioners requested a map of all historic resources showing buffers around each resource. Such a map would only indicate where development needs to be analyzed to ensure it is designed in a manner sensitive to historic resources. Mapped buffer areas would **not** mean “no build” or “low build only” zones. Each project proposal within a buffer of a historic resource would be evaluated on a case-by-case basis as to how it would or would not be protective of, or compatible with, nearby historic resources. In some cases, a buffer for a historic resource might affect a new structure’s architectural styling to ensure compatibility with the nearby resource. In other cases, a historic resources report might be required for the development to determine what, if any, impact the development proposal might have on the resources, and ways impacts could be avoided. In fact, a myriad of approaches such as setback and stepback variations, landscaping or other details can be implemented to ensure a neighborhood environment protective of a historic resource. Individual parcel tagging/flagging in the City’s Tidemark Advantage system to indicate case-by-case compatibility analysis is a more appropriate tool for buffer implementation. Staff is also working on a series of map layers to depict the resources and buffer distances.

**Site Visit.** One Planning Commissioner requested a site visit to see an example of a development built within a proposed buffered distance from a historic resource. The development project surrounding the Arlington Theater was discussed at the

hearing. Design Review of the project is directing a site layout that respects the architectural significance of the historic Arlington Theater. Since each case is so unique, the purpose and value of a Planning Commission visit to developments near historic resources appears unclear. The buffers which are part of the existing 2011 General Plan are an appropriate implementation tool and site visits are not necessary to verify the need for this existing General Plan item.

**Transfer of Development Rights Program.** Staff clarified for the Planning Commission, that item HR2.9, regarding a transfer of development rights program, could apply to parcels within the buffer distances of historic resources and that any details associated with such a program would be developed at the time a new transfer program is being considered.

**Wording Consistency.** A concern was expressed that various words were used for similar concepts in various places in the document. For example, the difference in meaning was questioned for wording such as “compatible development” versus “respectful development”; or “proximate” versus “near”. At the hearing, HRE Task Force representatives confirmed for the Planning Commission that the variation in words with similar meaning in various places in the document was intentional.

## **GENERAL PLAN & CODE CONSISTENCY ANALYSIS:**

The proposed HRE is consistent with the Santa Barbara General Plan, as required by California state planning laws. Following are examples of how the proposed HRE is supported by, and supports the Sustainability Framework and policies of other elements of the Santa Barbara General Plan.

- **Economic & Fiscal Health / Community Character.** The Land Use Element, Housing Element, Economy and Fiscal Health Element and HRE all support development which is compatible with community character, which can include preserving historic resources. The Economy and Fiscal Health Element also supports arts, crafts and culture, which is complementary to historic preservation. The City of Santa Barbara’s economy is very dependent on tourism. Santa Barbara’s tourism is supported by a visibly rich historic heritage, which can continue to be achieved through historic preservation.
- **Visual Preservation.** The Environmental Resources Element promotes visual resources protection, consistent with HRE viewscape protection items.
- **The Sustainability Framework** lists “Historic & Community Character” as one of the policy drivers that affects both the guiding principles and the goals and policies of the General Plan. Historic Resources are also discussed in the Plan’s **Principles for Development**.
- **Rehabilitation of Existing Buildings.** Land Use Element and Housing Element policies encourage rehabilitation of existing buildings, as does the proposed HRE. In addition, the Safety and Public Services Element encourages

earthquake insurance programs, which could be helpful to allow for higher quality reconstruction of historic resources in the event of destruction due to an earthquake.

- **Potential Public Acquisition of Historic Resources.** The acquisition of certain properties promoted by the Open Space, Parks and Recreation Element could result in the protection of historic resources, consistent with the HRE.
- **Pedestrian Transportation.** Both the Circulation Element and HRE promote pedestrian transportation.
- **Housing Unit Density.** The HRE proposes protection of historic resources through a number of means, including implementation of buffers and historic districts. A more detailed discussion of this item is included in the discussion of the Planning Commission's review of the Element in the previous section. Depending on how these mechanisms are implemented, the potential housing unit development density could be diminished for some potential development sites. Implementation of historic preservation mechanisms will need to be done in a way that is consistent with Housing and Land Use Element goals for production of affordable housing units. The General Plan's Adaptive Management Program (AMP) will monitor the production, location and affordability of housing units over time. The feedback of information through the AMP will allow for adjustments in policy implementation over time to ensure that all policies of the Housing, Land Use and proposed HRE are implemented in a manner that is consistent.

**Policy HR5 "Protect Neighborhood Historic Resources"**. This important policy addresses protection of traditional neighborhoods and could be implemented in a number of ways. Implementation item HR5.5 "Establish zoning that conforms to the character of neighborhoods" would entail a rezoning process. Staff would like to note that in the event that such a process is undertaken at some time in the future, one essential part of that study will be review for consistency within the General Plan as a whole, including consistency with the Average Unit-Size Density Incentive Program. Verification of any such rezoning conformance to State Planning and Zoning laws would also be needed. Staff does not suggest any revision to the language of Policy HR5, but provides this note as an advisory.

Although from a broad view, all of the elements are consistent, there will be individual cases where careful balancing in the implementation of the elements will be needed, for example:

- Some neighborhoods may be open to secondary dwelling units or other non-traditional neighborhood **development patterns**. Careful implementation of design guidelines and preservation of individual historic resources consistent with Land Use Element and Housing Element policies will be needed.

- Some individual historic landscapes may promote **potentially invasive species** such as invasive palm, olive or pepper tree species. Careful review of the Environmental Resources Element Biology section will be important in these cases.
- Some individual historic landscapes may include **water consumptive elements**, such as expansive high water use lawns. Careful review of the Environmental Resources Element Safety and Public Services Element Water Supply policies and water conservation municipal codes will be important in these cases.
- Some individual historic properties may merit **historic wood shingles or other combustible building materials**. Careful review of the Safety and Public Services Element Safety Hazard Identification and Reduction Chapter, local codes and the California State Historical Building Code will be needed in these cases.
- Some individual historic properties may merit adobe construction or other types of construction not traditionally clearly accommodated by standard wood frame construction or **seismic building codes**. Careful review of the Safety and Public Services Element Earthquake Safety Chapter, local codes and the California State Historical Building Code will be needed in these cases.

#### **ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW:**

A Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was completed for the Plan Santa Barbara General Plan Update (SCH 2009011031). An Addendum to the EIR has been prepared, Attachment 5. The Addendum documents that there would be no changes to the impacts of the General Plan Update as a result of the inclusion of the proposed HRE in the General Plan. The proposed Council Resolution includes environmental review findings to reflect the original certification of the EIR, adoption of the General Plan and the current adoption of the HRE.

#### **SUSTAINABILITY IMPACT:**

As with the December 2011 General Plan Update, this proposed HRE is premised on moving Santa Barbara towards a more sustainable future. Investment in older neighborhoods is a form of reinvestment in inherently sustainable communities that are generally less expensive, smaller in scale, walkable, transit-accessible and feature mixed uses. The continued use of older structures and the adaptive reuse of buildings lower the carbon footprint of the community. It is estimated that 25% of the material being added to landfills is demolition and construction waste. Preservation of older structures actually conserves resources by eliminating the environmental costs of new construction. Adaptive re-use or rehabilitation of a building has been found to create more local jobs, than what is spent on new construction which produces overall cost savings.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

1. Historic Resources Element Task Force Participants
2. Santa Barbara Natural History Museum 9/5/12 correspondence
3. Historic Landmarks Commission 7/18/12 minutes excerpt
4. Planning Commission 7/26/12 Minutes excerpt and Resolution 011-12
5. Addendum to Program Environmental Impact Report for the Plan Santa Barbara General Plan Update (SCH 2009011031)

Note: The proposed Historic Resources Element (HRE) and public comments submitted to the HLC and PC have been transmitted to the Mayor and Council and are available for review in the City Clerk's Office.

**PREPARED BY:** Heather Baker, AICP Project Planner

**SUBMITTED BY:** Paul Casey, Community Development Director

**APPROVED BY:** City Administrator's Office

## **Historic Resources Element Task Force Participants**

### **HRE Task Force Voting Members**

Judith D. Orias, Chair	HLC Historic Resources Element Subcommittee
Fermina B. Murray, Vice Chair	HLC Historic Resources Element Subcommittee
Stella M. Larson, Secretary	Planning Commission Assigned Representative

### **HRE Task Force Participants**

Mary Louise Days	Citizens Planning Association (CPA) & Santa Barbara Conservancy
Kellam de Forest	Pearl Chase Society
Anne Petersen	Santa Barbara Trust for Historic Preservation
Jeanne Kahre	Brinkerhoff Neighborhood
Wanda Livernois	Brinkerhoff Neighborhood (for initial meeting months)
Barbara Fosbrink	California State Parks, Channel Coast District
Sheila Lodge	Planning Commissioner
Joe Rution	(not affiliated)
Susette Naylor	(not affiliated)

**From:** John Johnson [JohnJ@SBNATURE2.ORG]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 05, 2012 2:10 PM  
**To:** Baker, Heather  
**Cc:** Karl Hutterer; Suzanne Elledge; Barbara Barker  
**Subject:** Comments on Historic Resources Element

Heather,

Here are some recommended revisions to HR1.5 and HR9.5 that reflect the concerns expressed in my July 26, 2012 e-mail correspondence with you:

HR1.5, Section a, regarding the environmental review process, 2<sup>nd</sup> session:  
“Consider notification/consultation of most likely descendants of Barbareño Chumash whose names appear on the City of Santa Barbara’s archaeological monitors list (recommended addition underlined).” I further recommend deleting the rest of the sentence as it appears now because it is highly ambiguous and invites non-Chumash individuals to supersede Barbareño Chumash descendants. This does not preclude any additional public comment.

HR9.5, Section c, regarding “supporting the creation of a permanent Chumash archaeological museum and interpretive center.” I recommend deleting Section c entirely, because the SB Museum of Natural History already fulfills this function with its world-class Chumash archaeological collection, exhibits, and on-going public programs pertaining to Chumash culture.

Please let me know if you have further questions. I will be on vacation from September 6-21 and will reply upon my return.

Sincerely,

John Johnson

---

John R. Johnson, Ph.D.  
Curator of Anthropology  
Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History  
2559 Puesta del Sol  
Santa Barbara, CA 93105  
(805) 682-4711, ext. 139  
FAX (805) 569-3170  
[jjohnson@sbnature2.org](mailto:jjohnson@sbnature2.org)

---



# City of Santa Barbara Planning Division

## HISTORIC LANDMARKS COMMISSION MINUTES

**Wednesday, July 18, 2012**

**David Gebhard Public Meeting Room: 630 Garden Street**

**1:30 P.M.**

**COMMISSION MEMBERS:**

PHILIP SUDING, *Chair* – Present  
DONALD SHARPE, *Vice-Chair* – Present  
LOUISE BOUCHER – Present  
MICHAEL DRURY – Present  
WILLIAM LA VOIE – Present  
FERMINA MURRAY – Present  
JUDY ORÍAS – Present until 6:56 p.m.  
CRAIG SHALLANBERGER – Absent  
BARRY WINICK – Present at 1:38 p.m.

**ADVISORY MEMBER:**

DR. MICHAEL GLASSOW – Absent

**CITY COUNCIL LIAISON:**

DALE FRANCISCO – Absent

**PLANNING COMMISSION LIAISON:**

STELLA LARSON – Present

**STAFF:**

JAIME LIMÓN, Design Review Supervisor – Present until 1:44 p.m. and again 3:06 p.m. to 3:58 p.m.  
NICOLE HERNÁNDEZ, Urban Historian – Present  
MICHAEL BERMAN, Project Planner/Environmental Analyst – Present until 1:44 p.m.  
SUSAN GANTZ, Planning Technician – Present until 5:45 p.m.  
GABRIELA FELICIANO, Commission Secretary – Present

**Website:** [www.SantaBarbaraCa.gov](http://www.SantaBarbaraCa.gov)

An archived video copy of this regular meeting of the Historic Landmarks Commission is viewable on computers with high speed internet access on the City website at [www.santabarbaraca.gov/hlc](http://www.santabarbaraca.gov/hlc) and then clicking on the *Meeting Videos* tab.

**CALL TO ORDER.**

The Full Board meeting was called to order at 1:32 p.m. by Chair Suding.

**ATTENDANCE:**

Members present: Boucher, Drury, La Voie, Murray, Orías, Sharpe, Suding, and Winick.

Members absent: Shallenberger.

Staff present: Limón (until 1:44 p.m. and again 3:06 p.m. to 3:58 p.m.), Hernández, Berman (until 1:44 p.m.), Gantz (until 2:41 p.m. and again 3:56 p.m. to 5:45 p.m.), and Feliciano.

**ACTION ITEM****4. PROPOSED HISTORIC RESOURCES ELEMENT**

(3:15) Presenter: Heather Baker, Project Planner

(On June 28, 2011, Council authorized a Historic Resources Element (HRE) Task Force to convene to draft a new Historic Resources Element. The new HRE is to supersede the Cultural and Historic Resources section of the existing General Plan Conservation Element. The rest of the existing Conservation Element would remain in place at this time. The HRE Task Force voting membership is two Historic Landmarks Commissioners and one Planning Commissioner. Representatives from various other community groups are included in the HRE Task Force and contributed to discussion and work on the HRE. The HRE Task Force has met approximately 20 times since July 2011 and has drafted 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.)

**(Staff's recommendation: That the Historic Landmarks Commission review the draft proposed HRE and recommend it for Council adoption.)**

Actual time: 3:00

Present: Heather Baker, City Project Planner

Public comment opened at 3:16 p.m.

Mary Louise Days, HRE Task Force, commented in support of the document and suggested revisions to the staff report. She also suggested revisions to the HRE: 1) Further delineation of *El Cuartel* on the "Historic, Special Design, and Landmark Districts" map in the HRE; and 2) Revise the language of the second bullet on page 7.

Stella Larson, Planning Commission member, commented in support of the document and expressed appreciation for the members of the Task Force and Staff that worked on the document.

Jean Kahre, local resident, commented in support of the document and expressed appreciation.

Lee Moldaver, local resident, commented in support of the document and expressed appreciation.

Susan Chamberlin, local resident and landscape historian, commented on need to incorporate the concept of "cultural landscapes" and suggested revisions throughout the HRE consistent with the Secretary of Interior's Standards.

Joe Rution, local resident, commented in support of the document and stated that the HRE does not affect affordable housing. He disagreed with the "Santa Barbara for All" comment letter.

Chair Suding acknowledged receipt of emails and letters from Mary Louise Days, Cathie McCammon, Robert Ooley, Anne Petersen, Santa Barbara for All, and the Santa Barbara Trust for Historic Preservation; and summarized concerns.

Public comment closed at 3:36 p.m.

The Commission expressed appreciation for the many hours spent by the HRE Task Force and members of the public in the production of this document.

**Motion: To recommend adoption of the proposed Historic Resources Element to the City Council with the comment that the Planning Commission and Historic Resources Element Task Force shall look into the merit of comments and suggestions made by Susan Chamberlin and Mary Louise Days.**

Action: Sharpe/Boucher, 8/0/0. Motion carried. (Shallanberger absent.)



# 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 28<sup>th</sup>, 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 28<sup>th</sup>, 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 Pujo 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.**



**ADDENDUM TO PROGRAM ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT  
for the Plan Santa Barbara General Plan Update (SCH 2009011031)  
FOR: CITY OF SANTA BARBARA PROPOSED HISTORIC RESOURCES  
ELEMENT**

July 3, 2012

This addendum to the certified Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the *Plan Santa Barbara* General Plan Update documents California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) analysis for the proposed Historic Resources Element. The proposed Element would amend the City of Santa Barbara General Plan and replace the existing General Plan Historic Resources Framework and Cultural Resources Section of the Conservation Element. Associated changes to project impacts fall within the range of policy options, growth scenarios, and impacts studied in the FEIR, and do not raise new environmental issues.

**EIR ADDENDUM PROCEDURES**

This EIR Addendum is prepared in accordance with State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15168 (Program EIR) and 15164 (Addendum to an EIR).

Section 15168 provides that a Program EIR may be prepared on a series of actions characterized as one large project, such as a citywide General Plan update. This allows for a comprehensive consideration of policies and effects, and avoids later duplicative environmental analysis. When subsequent implementing actions are undertaken, the activities may be approved as within the scope of the Plan covered by the Program EIR when no new significant effects would occur.

Section 15164 provides that an Addendum to a previous EIR may be prepared to document changes that make the prior EIR adequate for the current project when the changes are not associated with new significant impacts or substantial increases in previously identified impacts.

The Guidelines provide that an EIR Addendum need not be circulated for public review, but is attached to the EIR. The decision-making body (City Council) considers the Addendum together with the certified EIR in making a decision on the project.

**PRIOR ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT**

The Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the 2011 General Plan update was certified by the Planning Commission in September 2010 and by City Council in December 2011.

The General Plan Program EIR evaluated citywide effects on the environment from incremental growth to the year 2030 under General Plan policies and programs. The General Plan contemplates growth by the year 2030 of up to 1.5 million square feet of net additional commercial and other non-residential development and up to 2,800 additional housing units.

### **Class 1 Impacts**

The EIR analysis identified significant traffic and climate change impacts that could not be fully mitigated (Class 1 impacts) from General Plan policies and citywide incremental growth to the year 2030. An increase from 13 to 20-26 roadway intersections at 77% or greater volume-to-capacity ratio was identified. Citywide greenhouse gas emissions were projected as increasing and therefore potentially not meeting State AB 32 emission targets for 2020 and then-undefined SB 375 regional targets.

The EIR also identified that these traffic and climate change impacts could potentially be substantially reduced with implementation of a robust expansion of transportation demand management measures including parking pricing. These mitigation measures were included in the General Plan but City Council found that providing an upfront commitment as to the extent and method and timing of implementation was not feasible. As such, full mitigation credit was not given for the purpose of CEQA impact analysis. In adopting the General Plan, the City Council adopted findings of overriding consideration that the benefits of the Plan outweighed these potential significant impacts, thereby finding these impacts to be acceptable.

An Addendum to the FEIR (6-18-12) for the proposed City Climate Action Plan documents further analysis of climate change demonstrating that impacts associated with citywide greenhouse gas emissions would be less than significant (Class 2).

### **Class 2 Impacts**

The EIR analysis identified the following potentially significant impacts that could be mitigated to less than significant levels (Class 2 impacts): air quality (*diesel emissions*); biological resources (*upland and creek/riparian habitats and species*); geological conditions (*sea cliff retreat*); heritage resources (*effects of development on historic resources*); hydrology (*extended range sea level rise*); noise (*transportation noise*); open space (*loss or fragmentation of open space*); public utilities (*solid waste management*); and transportation (*intersections with mitigation; roadway corridor congestion*).

Identified mitigation measures associated with these impacts were incorporated into the General Plan as policies and programs.

### **Class 3 Impacts**

The EIR analysis concluded that with policies and programs already in place, the following other impacts would be less than significant (Class 3 impacts): air quality (*consistency with Clean Air Plan for air quality standards; construction emissions*); biological resources (*grasslands; coastal resources; individual specimen trees*); geological conditions (*seismic, geologic, soil hazards*); hazards (*accident risks, wildfire; hazardous materials*); heritage resources (*archeological and paleontological resources*); hydrology and water quality (*development in floodplains and near creeks; storm water runoff; water quality of creeks, groundwater, coastal and marine water*); noise (*noise guidelines; mixed use nuisance noise; construction noise*); open space and visual resources (*scenic views; community character; lighting*); public services (*police; fire protection; parks and recreation; schools*); public utilities (*water supply, wastewater treatment*); transportation (*reduction in per capita vehicle commute trips – Class 4 beneficial*).

## **Additional Environmental Analysis**

The EIR also included detailed analysis of impacts associated with energy, climate change (both greenhouse gas emissions contributing to climate change, and climate change effects on the City), population and jobs/housing balance, and socioeconomic issues.

## **CHANGES IN ENVIRONMENTAL CIRCUMSTANCES**

No substantial changes in environmental circumstances on the ground have occurred since the December 2011 General Plan adoption and EIR certification. No changes to Federal or State historic resources regulations or guidelines have occurred.

## **CURRENT PROJECT DESCRIPTION: HISTORIC RESOURCES ELEMENT AMENDMENT**

The Historic Resources Element (HRE) proposed goals, policies, and implementation measures are similar to the policies analyzed in the 2011 General Plan Update HRE and the Cultural and Historic Resources section of the Conservation Element. The following policy topics appear in the 2011 General Plan HRE and/or Conservation Element as well as the proposed HRE:

- Protection of historic and archaeological resources through appropriate regulatory tools such as buffers, transfer of development rights, reduced densities near resources, adaptive reuse, design districts, designations  
*Conservation Element:* Policies 2.0 and 3.0  
*2011 HRE Framework:* Policies HR2-Historic Structures and HR3-Historic Resource Protection  
*6-18-12 Task Force HRE:* Policies HR1-Protect Historic and Archeological Resources
- Protection of historic and archaeological resources through ensuring compatible development through review processes  
*Conservation Element:* Policy 1.0  
*2011 HRE Framework:* Policy HR4-Development Adjacent Historic Structures  
*6-18-12 Task Force HRE:* Policy HR2-Ensure Respectful and Compatible Development
- Adaptive reuse support  
*2011 HRE Framework:* Policy HR1-Adaptive Reuse  
*6-18-12 Task Force HRE:* Policy HR4-Adaptive Reuse
- Promoting public awareness of historic and archaeological resources  
*2011 HRE Framework:* Policies HR5-Increase Historical Appreciation and HR6-Chumash Culture and Archeological Resources  
*6-18-12 Task Force HRE:* Policy HR9-Increase Awareness of Santa Barbara's Heritage
- Surveying, documenting and designating historic resources in the community  
*Conservation Element:* Policies 2.0 and 3.0  
*2011 HRE Framework:* Policy HR3-Historic Resource Protection  
*6-18-12 Task Force HRE:* Policy HR8-Survey and Document All Historic Resources
- Governmental coordination, uniformity in regulations, and effectiveness in addressing and protecting historic and archaeological resources  
*Conservation Element:* Policy 4.0  
*6-18-12 Task Force HRE:* Policy HR10-Assure Governmental Effectiveness

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 Historic Resources Element.

Additional and more detailed goals, policies and implementation items are included in the proposed HRE. The intent of the new items is the same as it was for the existing documents, and the result of the new items may be greater protection of historic resources in some cases. New topics include the following:

**Two new goals** elevate topics of governmental effectiveness (“Governmental Cooperation”) and the importance of historic resources preservation in neighborhoods (“Neighborhood Historic Preservation”).

**New policies** and associated implementation measures expand on the importance of:

- avoiding demolition of historic resources (Policy HR3-Discourage Demolition)
- protection of neighborhood historic resources (Policy HR5-Protect Neighborhood Historic Resources)
- streetscape and landscape historic resources (Policies HR6-Protect Traditional Public Resources and Streetscapes and HR7-Protect Historic Landscapes)
- surveying and documenting resources (Policy HR8-Survey and Document All Historic Resources)

## **FINAL PROJECT IMPACTS AND MITIGATIONS**

**Historic Resources** - The FEIR analysis found impacts of the General Plan Update to be less than significant with incorporation of additional policy protections for historic resources, including buffer provisions and additional design/historic district protections (Class 2 impact). The FEIR Hybrid Alternative assumed incorporation of these additional policy protections and also reduced the area for higher density residential development in the Downtown to assure compatibility with the historic character. The final GPU also incorporated the additional buffer and district policy protections and further reduced areas with the higher density incentive designations.

The proposed Historic Resources Element has wording revisions and additions to the Conservation Element policies and 2011 GPU policies (including FEIR mitigation measures incorporated as GPU policies), but the intent and effect of the refined policies is similar. [Note: policy numbers have changed between the FEIR, the Conservation Element and 2011 adopted GPU; and the proposed replacement HRE.]

The historic resources impacts of the final GPU with incorporation of the proposed Historic Resources Element would be similar or slightly less than impacts identified in the FEIR and would remain **less than significant (Class 2)**.

**Open Space and Visual Resources** – Policy provisions directing in-fill development to central areas of the City and providing programs protective of open space remain unchanged by the proposed HRE. There is a policy directing protection of viewsapes in the proposed HRE which would further support visual resource protection. The impact of gradual loss of open space would remain **less than significant (Class 3)**.

**Other Impacts** – Environmental impacts under the HRE policy amendments would be similar to those identified in the FEIR. No changes from impact significance classifications identified in the FEIR (i.e., Class 1, 2, or 3 impacts) would result from refinements to the historic resources protection policies.

Most of the mitigation measures identified in the FEIR to reduce potentially significant impacts were incorporated into the final General Plan Update policies and programs. These measures address traffic congestion; greenhouse gas generation; highway diesel exhaust; upland, creek/riparian, and coastal habitats and species; coastal bluff retreat; hazardous materials collection facility capacity; historic resources; sea level rise; highway noise; open space; solid waste management facility capacity, and jobs/housing balance.

**CEQA FINDING**

Based on the Addendum review of the proposed Historic Resources Element, in accordance with State CEQA Guidelines Section 15612, no Subsequent Negative Declaration or Environmental Impact Report is required for the project because the project setting, description, impacts, and mitigations do not involve new significant impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of impacts previously identified in the final General Plan Program EIR.

This Addendum, together with the certified Program EIR, constitutes adequate environmental documentation in compliance with CEQA for the proposed Historic Resources Element.

Prepared by: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
Heather Baker, AICP Project Planner

Reviewed by: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
Bettie Weiss, City Planner

References:

Certified Final EIR for *Plan Santa Barbara* General Plan Update (September 2010) and FEIR Addendum (December 2011).

Addendum to Program Environmental Impact Report for the *Plan Santa Barbara* General Plan Update for draft City of Santa Barbara Climate Action Plan (June 18, 2012).



# Proposed Historic Resources Element

City Council

October 2, 2012



# Presentation Outline

- I. Background
- II. HRE Contents
- III. Consistent w/ General Plan & Codes
- IV. Environmental Review
- V. HLC & PC Review & Public Comments
- VI. Recommendation



# RECOMMENDATION that the Council:

- ◆ Review the HRE and its associated environmental addendum
- ◆ Adopt, by reading of title only, A Resolution of the Council of the City of Santa Barbara Adopting the Historic Resources Element.



# Housing Resource Element (HRE) Background

- ◆ Interest in HRE to be part of the City's General Plan expressed in Plan SB process
- ◆ Initial goals, policies, and possible implementation actions are in adopted 12/11 Plan
- ◆ HRE development is part of first phase of General Plan implementation



# HRE Background

2011 interest in HRE development:

- ◆ Historic Landmarks Commission
- ◆ Planning Commission
- ◆ Council Ad Hoc Subcommittee
- ◆ Allied Neighborhood Association
- ◆ Historic preservation groups



# Historic Resource Element Gives Structure to an Historic Work Program

## Example Proposed Projects:

- ◆ potential new historic districts formations
- ◆ a new set of design guidelines for historic properties
- ◆ zoning ordinance incentives for historic property preservation
- ◆ updated environmental review guidance
- ◆ historic designations



# Historic Resource Element Task Force Membership Authorized by Council 6/28/11

## 3 City Representatives – Official Voting Members

2 members HLC Subcommittee:

*Judy Orias , Chair*

*Fermina Murray, Vice Chair*

1 member PC:

*Stella Larson, Secretary*



# Historic Resource Element Task Force Membership

## Additional Public Participants – Non-Voting

- ◆ Mary Louise Days, Citizens Planning Association
- ◆ Kellam de Forest , Pearl Chase Society
- ◆ Anne Petersen, SB Trust for Historic Preservation
- ◆ Jean Kahre, Brinkerhoff Neighborhood
- ◆ Sheila Lodge, PC Member
- ◆ Barbara Fosbrink, State Parks
- ◆ Susette Naylor, unaffiliated
- ◆ Joe Rution, unaffiliated
- ◆ Wanda Livernois (initially), Allied Neighborhood Association



# Historic Resource Element Work & Review to Date

- ◆ SB General Plan HRE Framework adopted, 12/11
- ◆ HRE Task Force 22 mtgs., 7/11 – 7/12
- ◆ SB Museum of Natural History CA Indian Advisory Comm., 5/12
- ◆ City Attorney Office review, 4/12, 6/12 & 9/12
- ◆ Historic Landmarks Commission Hearing, 7/28/12
- ◆ Planning Commission Hearing, 7/26/12



# Proposed HRE Covers Topics in existing Consvtn. Element & 2011 HRE Framework

- ◆ Protection through regulatory tools
- ◆ Protection through compatible development
- ◆ Public awareness
- ◆ Surveys & documentation
- ◆ Governmental coordination




# New Goal & Policy Topics

## New goals

- ◆ Governmental Effectiveness
- ◆ Neighborhood Historic Preservation

## New Policies

- ◆ Discourage demolition
- ◆ Protecting neighborhood historic resources
- ◆ Streetscape & landscape historic resources
- ◆ Surveying, documenting & designating





# Proposed HRE is Consistent with other General Plan Elements

- ◆ Economic & Fiscal Health Element
- ◆ Sustainability Framework
- ◆ Environmental Resources Element (including Visual Preservation)
- ◆ Housing Element
- ◆ Land Use Element
- ◆ Safety & Public Services Element
- ◆ Open Space, Parks and Recreation Element
- ◆ Circulation Element



# Proposed HRE & Housing Element

- ◆ **Housing Unit Density.** Affect of buffers and historic districts implementation will be monitored over time.
- ◆ **Policy HR5 “Protect Neighborhood Historic Resources”.** Implementation item HR5.5 “Establish zoning that conforms to the character of neighborhoods” would entail a rezoning process that will need to be reviewed for consistency with GP & other regulations.



# Environmental Review Addendum

- ◆ See Exhibit D: Addendum to Program Environmental Impact Report for the Plan Santa Barbara General Plan Update (SCH 2009011031)
- ◆ No changes to impacts as a result of inclusion of the HRE in the SB General Plan.



## Public Comment Letters

- ◆ Robert Ooley, AIA 7/12
- ◆ Santa Barbara Trust for Historic Preservation recvd. 7/12
- ◆ Cathie McCammon 7/17/12
- ◆ Mary Louise Days 7/17/12
- ◆ Santa Barbara for All 7/17/12 & 10/12
- ◆ Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History 9/12



# Historic Landmarks Commission Review, 7/28/12

- ◆ unanimous adoption support
- ◆ direction to include term “cultural landscapes” (re: Susan Chamberlin comment)
- ◆ direction for HRE Task Force to meet to review public comments.
- ◆ HRE Task Force subsequently met and reviewed public comments, making minor amendments.



# Planning Commission Review, 7/26/12


## Discussion Topics:

- ◆ HR 2.10.a Buffers
- ◆ HR 2.8 “Reduce densities”
- ◆ Historic Resource Map
- ◆ Site Visit
- ◆ Transfer of Development Rights Programs
- ◆ Wording Consistency

# Example: Arlington 100' buffer illustration

Key:

- = Structure of Merit
- = Landmark



Pending Project

Approved Project

Approved Project


100 ft

# Example: Brinkerhoff 100' buffer illustration


Key:



= Structure of Merit




# Example: Presidio 250' buffer illustration






# RECOMMENDATION that the Council:

- ◆ Review the HRE and its associated environmental addendum
- ◆ Adopt, by reading of title only, A Resolution of the Council of the City of Santa Barbara Adopting the Historic Resources Element.



# Average Unit Size Density-Incentive Program





# HR2.10 Employ Historic Resource Buffers

HR2.10 Employ historic resource buffers. Use the following measures to establish buffer zones to further protect historic resources:

- a. Require that all parcels within 100 feet of a historic resource be identified and flagged for scrutiny for impacts on those resources, prior to either approval of any development application, ~~or consideration of increased densities for rental, employer and/or Affordable Housing.~~



## HR2.10 Employ Historic Resource Buffers

- b. All development proposed within 250 feet of historic adobe structures, El Presidio de Santa Barbara State Historic Park and areas inclusive of the original footprint of the Presidio and other City Landmarks **may be** subject to measures for additional protection. Such protection may require adjustments in height, bulk, size, and setbacks.



# HR2.10 Employ Historic Resource Buffers

- c. Establish buffers with priority focus on properties near historic and landmark districts.

---

*Buffer (or buffer zones)* - An area, developed or undeveloped, that separates a resource from potentially incompatible development, that serves to soften, mitigate or resolve potential conflict or incompatibility.



# Proposed HRE is Consistent with Santa Barbara Municipal Codes

Careful implementation of HRE in regards to certain topics will be needed to ensure consistency:

- ◆ Landscapes avoiding invasive species
- ◆ Water conserving landscaping
- ◆ CA State Historical Building Code for special building materials in regards to fire and earthquake safety
- ◆ Development patterns



# Revise HR1.5

## **HR1.5 Archaeological Monitors List.**

Protect archaeological resources from potential damage or destruction.

In the environmental review process, any proposed project which is in an area indicated on the map as "sensitive" shall receive further study to determine if archaeological resources are present and in jeopardy. Consider notification/consultation of most likely descendants of Barbareno Chumash whose names appear on the City of Santa Barbara archaeological monitors list.



# Revise HR9.5

**HR9.5 Improve Awareness.** Encourage and participate in partnerships between the City, developers, landowners and representation from most likely descendants of Barbareno Chumash; and local Native American associations and individuals to increase the visibility of Chumash history and culture by:

- Supporting public displays of Chumash arts, culture and history,
- Encouraging the incorporation of elements from Chumash art and culture into public and private development,
- Supporting the creation of a permanent Chumash archaeological museum and interpretive center in addition to those of the Santa Barbara Natural History Museum.